



V. SOLODOVNIKOV, V. BOGOSLOVSKY

Non-Capitalist Development

An Historical Outline



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by A. Bratov

В. Г. СОЛОДОВНИКОВ, В. В. БОГОСЛОВСКИЙ
ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ ОПЫТ
НЕКАПИТАЛИСТИЧЕСКОГО РАЗВИТИЯ

На английском языке

First printing 1975

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1975

© Translation into English. Progress Publishers 1975

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

C 10601—079 83—75
C 014(01)—75

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
Chapter 1. THE MARXIST-LENINIST CONCEPTION OF NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT. THE THEORETICAL STATEMENT OF THE QUES- TION	13
The Fabrications of the Imperialists and the Unscien- tific Views of the Opportunists	14
The Founders of Marxism on the Non-Capitalist Way	19
Lenin's Elaboration of the Conception of Non-Capi- talist Development	22
The Creative Development of the Leninist Conception of Non-Capitalist Development and Its Appli- cation in Practice	29
Chapter 2. THE EXPERIENCE IN NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS AND MONGOLIA	36
The Soviet Central Asian Republics' Level of Socio- Economic Development Prior to the Beginning of the Non-Capitalist Stage of Development	39
Great October Opened Up the Non-Capitalist Road of Development	41
Abolition of Colonialism and Feudalism	46
Development of Various Forms of Cooperation	58
The Cultural Revolution—an Integral Part of Non- Capitalist Development	67
The Socialist Reconstruction of Agriculture and Socialist Industrialisation	74
Living Embodiment of Socialism	79

CONTENTS

Chapter 3. THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF STATES WITH A SOCIALIST ORIENTATION—THE NEW PHASE OF THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST REVOLUTION	85
The Character of National Liberation Revolutions Today	87
The Crisis of Capitalism and Its Historical Doom	90
Basic Content of the Socialist Orientation	97
Recent Experience of Economic Changes Along Non-Capitalist Lines	105
Chapter 4. THE MOTIVE FORCES OF SOCIALIST ORIENTATION. NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT—A FORM OF CLASS STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM	121
On the Role of the Working Class	123
The Peasantry and Socialism	128
The Intelligentsia, the National Bourgeoisie and Other Social Strata	133
National Democracy and Scientific Socialism	139
a) The Attitude of Marxists-Leninists Towards Nationalism	142
b) The Attitude of Marxists-Leninists to Religion	146
c) The Attitude of Marxists-Leninists to Private Property	153
d) Attitude of Marxists-Leninists Towards Freedom of the Individual	156
The Unity of Progressive Forces—the Guarantee of Victory for the Socialist Orientation	160
Chapter 5. THE NON-CAPITALIST WAY OF DEVELOPMENT AND THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE TWO SYSTEMS	164
The Reactionary Essence of the Concept of "Two Super-Powers"	166
Neo-Colonialism, the Enemy of the Socialist Orientation	172
World Socialism—a Powerful Support for Non-Capitalist Development	182
a) The Economic and Technical Assistance of the Soviet Union and Other Socialist Countries	185

CONTENTS

7

b) The Foreign Trade of the Socialist Countries —an Important Factor in the Progress of the Developing Countries	197
c) Socialist Integration and the Struggle of the Newly Independent Countries for Socialism	210
Chapter 6. SOME ASPECTS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE FOR THE WAYS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES	217
Non-Proletarian Conceptions of Socialism and the Content of Imperialism's Ideological Subversion	218
The Hegemonic Nature of Maoism	222
Marxist-Leninist Assessment of the Non-Proletarian Conceptions of Socialism. The Brilliant Example of the Evolution of the Views of Gamal Abdel Nasser	232
CONCLUSION	245

INTRODUCTION

We are living in a great epoch—an epoch that began with the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and has as its main content the transition from capitalism to socialism. Although imperialism still remains a serious and dangerous enemy of the peoples, it no longer holds undivided sway over the world. The high road of mankind's progressive social development is being built by the great forces of world socialism, the international working-class and the national liberation movement. Imperialism is being subjected to increasing pressure from forces that have emerged in the process of the national liberation struggle, above all from the young sovereign states of Asia and Africa.

About eighty independent countries have emerged on the ruins of imperialism's colonial system. The first phase of the national liberation revolution is essentially completed. Most of the colonial peoples have won political independence. The young states now face new and complicated tasks, chief among which is to free themselves from economic dependence and abolish age-old backwardness. These peoples want to be the masters of all the riches and resources of their own countries and to attain a high level of material and cultural development, using for this purpose all the achievements of modern science and technology.

Which road of social development any one of these countries has embarked on was determined by the balance of class forces within the country and the degree of its economic dependence on imperialism. Some countries have taken the road of capitalist development, others have set out on the non-capitalist road. In a number of countries the question still remains undecided.

However, typical of the present situation in all Afro-Asian countries is that the national liberation struggle is developing more or less intensively into a fight against exploitative relations, both feudal and capitalist. More than one-fifth of the newly independent countries of Africa have already embarked on a non-capitalist road of development, while social forces advocating non-capitalist development are also rapidly maturing within the social structures of other developing countries. The national liberation revolution is taking an increasingly pronounced anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist direction.

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties pointed to the fact that in many Asian and African countries "the national liberation movement has entered a new phase", and stressed in its final document that "some young states have taken the non-capitalist path, a path which opens up the possibility of overcoming the backwardness inherited from the colonial past and creates conditions for transition to socialist development. In these countries the socialist orientation is making headway, overcoming great difficulties and trials."¹

In recent years, the socialist orientation has been growing more and more distinct and acquiring new content.

The national-democratic revolution in the countries of Asia and Africa is characterised by much that is new, unique, and sometimes contradictory; its development

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 28.*

by no means follows a straight line. But despite the fact that many features of non-capitalist development have not yet become distinct, despite the fact that, due to a number of factors, this development is sometimes interrupted or retarded, on the whole it is proceeding along an ascending line. The non-capitalist road of development stands before the revolutionary forces of the Third World as a concrete historical reality. This phenomenon is becoming increasingly important in the world revolutionary process and therefore calls for deep and thoroughgoing analysis. Of substantial help in accomplishing this task is the rich experience of the Soviet republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and the Mongolian People's Republic, all of whom have traversed the road of non-capitalist development. Some experience in non-capitalist development has also been accumulated by the Arab Republic of Egypt, Algeria, Syria, Burma, Guinea and other countries with a socialist orientation. A review of this concrete experience makes it possible to reveal the general regularities and specific features of non-capitalist development and to show its advantages over capitalist development.

What internal and external conditions are necessary for non-capitalist development? On what common principles is the alliance of Communist and revolutionary-democratic parties consolidated? How is new government machinery created in the countries of non-capitalist development? Answers to these and many other questions are being sought by revolutionary democrats in Asia and Africa, leaders of national-democratic parties, and all fighters for freedom, genuine independence and progress.

Drawing on studies made by Soviet and foreign scholars and analysing the experience in non-capitalist development accumulated by a number of peoples of the USSR and other countries, the authors of this book describe the factors that make it possible for non-capitalist development to ensure the victory of socialist revolution. The book investigates ways and means of overcoming contradictions and difficulties that emerge in the process of non-capitalist development.

Much attention is given to the current ideological struggle around the question of paths of social development in newly independent countries and to exposing neo-colonialist conceptions of this development. The book also lays bare the anti-Marxist essence of Maoism and the danger it poses to the cause of socialism in Asia and Africa.

The authors will be sincerely grateful for any comments on the book from the reader.

THE MARXIST-LENINIST CONCEPTION OF NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT. THE THEORETICAL STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION

Marxism-Leninism emerged as a scientific world outlook more than a century ago. Since then it has won the hearts and minds of millions of working people all over the world; it has not only shown them the road of struggle for liberation from imperialist and colonial oppression, but has led them to victory and power in many countries and to the formation of socialist countries in Europe, Asia and Latin America. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism arm the progressive forces of the developing and colonial countries with the conception of the non-capitalist road of development.

Bourgeois scholars and organs of bourgeois propaganda, in their effort to hold back the development of the liberated and colonial countries and to keep many countries of the Third World dependent upon the monopoly capital of the imperialist states, try to show that Marxist-Leninist theory is not applicable to the conditions prevailing in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. However, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism are becoming more and more widespread on those continents, and with every passing year they score fresh victories. Even bourgeois theorists—at least those for whom an objective approach to an evaluation of historical processes is not entirely alien—have to admit this fact. Jules Girardi, for instance, a well-known philosopher in the West, admits that Marx's ideas are more and more strongly attracting "the masses and the intellectuals, the poor and the rich, peoples with ancient cultures and young peoples. It

[Marxism.—Ed.] has its dedicated, ardent and noble militants, its heroes and its martyrs."¹

The conception of non-capitalist development—an integral part of Marxism-Leninism—is winning the minds of people in the liberated countries of the Third World. In a number of these countries it is already being implemented, finding practical expression in profound socio-economic changes of an anti-capitalist character. The practical results of these changes provide conclusive evidence that the attempts of bourgeois scholars and propagandists to distort and falsify the essence of the Marxist-Leninist conception of non-capitalist development run counter to the interests of the peoples of the newly independent countries.

THE FABRICATIONS OF THE IMPERIALISTS AND THE UNSCIENTIFIC VIEWS OF THE OPPORTUNISTS

The enemies of the non-capitalist road of development from the countries of the imperialist camp try to persuade the peoples of the Third World that this way is unsuitable for the countries of Asia and Africa. Professor George Berg of the University of Michigan writes that for a number of reasons there is little likelihood of success along the road of socialist modernisation, since the main demands of a policy of socialist construction are not in keeping with present-day African conditions. Among such reasons, Berg lists the difficult climatic conditions in Africa, the ossified structure of the African community, and the lack of skilled workers.

Berg's arguments do not stand up under criticism, since all the causes (lack of skilled personnel, the indifference of the African community, etc.) of retarded economic development can be eliminated in the process of socio-economic transformations.

What recommendations do Berg and other ideologists of imperialism have for the newly independent countries? In what direction are they trying to point them? Their approach is to distort and falsify the Marxist-Leninist

¹ Jules Girardi, *Marxisme et christianisme*, Desclée, 1968, p. 19.

theory of socialist revolution, hoping thereby to evoke in the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America distrust in the historical experience of non-capitalist development of the Soviet Central Asian republics and the whole experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, i.e., to implant a negative attitude towards socialism. Slandorous fabrications regarding the living conditions of the Soviet peoples of Central Asia are found in such books as *The Soviet Middle East. A Communist Model for Development*, by British "experts" on Central Asia Alec Nove and J. A. Newth; *Beyond the Urals. Economic Development in Soviet Asia*, by Violet Conolly, a former "Russian specialist" in the Foreign Office; *The Soviet Model and Underdeveloped Countries*, by Charles K. Wilber, an American writer.¹

These and other books of this kind try to belittle the great achievements of the peoples of Soviet Central Asia and distort reality.

In their all-out effort to oppose the Soviet Union to the Third World and to change the socio-political orientation of the newly independent countries, to steer them onto the road of capitalist development, the authors of such books are even prepared to go as far as to mislead these countries. West German Africanist Franz Ansprenger, for instance, states that "The Soviet Union... is already so industrialised in the eyes of the African that it cannot be regarded as an interesting model in its present form..."² American sociologist William McCord argues in the same vein when he says that the "Russian model" should be rejected for economic reasons, because "emerging nations today cannot afford to waste their more meager resources in the grandiose fashion which Russia did".³

¹ A. Nove and J. A. Newth, *The Soviet Middle East. A Communist Model for Development*, London, 1966; V. Conolly, *Beyond the Urals. Economic Development in Soviet Asia*, London, 1967; Ch. K. Wilber, *The Soviet Model and Underdeveloped Countries*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1969.

² *The Soviet Bloc, China and Africa*, edited by S. Hamrell and C. Widstrand, Uppsala, 1964, p. 92.

³ William McCord, *The Springtime of Freedom. Evolution of Developing Societies*, New York, 1965, p. 58.

Wishing to detract from the greatness of the ideas of scientific socialism, the bourgeois theorists maintain that many of these ideas have already been implemented in the capitalist countries, that modern capitalism has become something other than it was in the 19th century and even different from what it was prior to the Second World War, that it is now a social system in which social contradictions and class struggle have disappeared. Moreover, some ideologists of imperialism—American sociologists Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington and others—state that socialism is acquiring capitalist features, that in the age of the scientific and technological revolution it is becoming “more and more similar” to modern capitalism. The meaning of such assertions is clear: there is no need for the revolutionary forces of today to struggle for socialism, because capitalism has changed its nature and has begun to resemble socialism and socialism is acquiring capitalist features. Hence, bourgeois ideologists and politicians strenuously advise the liberated countries to choose a “third way” of social development, one that supposedly lies somewhere in between capitalism and socialism. Former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs T. E. Slater, for example, made a direct appeal to the newly independent countries to follow a “third road”.¹

The fact is, however, that the call to follow a “third road” is nothing other than a call to give unlimited freedom to private enterprise in the newly independent states, to allow imperialist monopolies to operate unimpeded and to let foreign and local capital strengthen their positions there. One argument that George Berg gives in support of his contention that the “third road” has advantages over the non-capitalist way is that a socialist economy, in which the state plays the leading role, is much more complicated than the market system. Socialism’s centralised control of the economy requires many more trained people than the decentralised market system.

¹ *Education and Training in the Developing Countries. The Role of U.S. Foreign Aid*, edited by William Y. Elliott. New York, 1966, p. 339.

In places where private African entrepreneurs have displayed an ability for efficient action, the establishment of firm state control would entail huge expenditures of skilled personnel and it is unlikely even then that government functionaries would be able to carry out the work as successfully as the private entrepreneurs.

In this way, Berg advertises the capitalist order of things—private property, in which the dog-eat-dog principle operates. For it is precisely this principle that characterises the capitalist world, where the big monopolies create unbearable conditions for the working people, where they use unemployment to force workers to accept the vilest of working conditions and low-paying jobs; where the state and police apparatus is used against the working people; where big capital dictates the government’s foreign and domestic policy; where the assassination of statesmen who happen to disagree with something in these policies has become a common occurrence; where the monopolies swallow up and strangle even their own weaker partners in competition; where corruption, crime and espionage of all kinds have attained monstrous proportions.

Violent attacks against the Marxist-Leninist conception of non-capitalist development come from other sources besides the obvious ideologists of imperialism. They come also from Peking, from the champions of Maoist great-power chauvinism, who see in the realisation of this conception a threat to their own hegemonic plans for establishing ideological and political dominance in the newly independent countries of the Third World. One of their tactics is to distort the meaning and significance of Lenin’s ideas of non-capitalist development. In fact, Chen Po-ta, a leader of the group conducting the affairs of the “cultural revolution”, even declared that Lenin was in no position at all to talk about the non-capitalist way of development because Russia was a capitalist country, and that only Mao Tse-tung could point to the path along which all backward countries should go. In October 1967, *Jen-min jih-pao*, central organ of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, directed its attack against the Mongolian People’s Repub-

lic and its experience along the non-capitalist road—an experience which has shown the possibility of advancing successfully towards socialism without going through the capitalist stage of development.

The Maoists attack the Marxist-Leninist conception of non-capitalist development because it stands opposed to the Maoist line that the transition to socialism must of necessity be reduced to armed struggle and armed struggle alone. The “Left” opportunists ignore the concrete historical situation; they shut their eyes to the changes that are taking place in the world and distort reality to fit their own formulas and schemes.

But a dogmatic approach to theory is characteristic not only of the “Left” opportunists. Anyone who loses touch with reality, anyone who, in learning various Marxist formulas, fails to grasp the very essence of Marxist-Leninist teaching, will inevitably commit serious errors and ultimately distort this teaching. This is what happened with Yugoslav writer M. Miljanovic. In an article entitled “The Classics of Marxism and the So-Called Non-Capitalist Road of Development”, Miljanovic tries to show by means of separate quotations that Marx and Engels saw only one possibility for the transition of all peoples to socialism, and that was through capitalist development.

We have pointed out in this part of the first chapter some of the directions taken by those who oppose the Marxist-Leninist conception of non-capitalist development, a conception that is becoming the banner of the progressive forces of the newly independent countries in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. These forces must know their enemies well and be able to recognise their ideological baggage and weapons. They want to achieve a profound understanding of the essence of the Marxist-Leninist conception of non-capitalist development in order to use it as an ideological weapon in their struggle. And it goes without saying that it is very important for them to have a clear and accurate understanding of how Marx and Engels approached the problem of non-capitalist development.

THE FOUNDERS OF MARXISM ON THE NON-CAPITALIST WAY

Miljanovic and certain other critics of the non-capitalist way of development generally cite an objective law of the historical process discovered by Marx—the law of succession of socio-economic formations—to substantiate their arguments. According to this law, mankind passes in its development through definite historical stages and cannot skip over any phase of development.

But in citing this Marxist law, the enemies of the non-capitalist way, wittingly or unwittingly, ignore one very important circumstance, namely, that Marx related it to human society as a whole, to a society in which capitalism was in the ascent. As concerns each individual people, each individual country, Marx felt that it does not necessarily have to go through all of the socio-economic formations known to man. In a letter to the editors of the Russian magazine, *Otechestvenniye zapiski*, Marx came out against attempts by one of the critics of Marxism to “metamorphose my [Marx’s.—Ed.] historical sketch of the genesis of capitalism in Western Europe into an historico-philosophic theory of the general path every people is fated to tread, whatever the historical circumstances in which it finds itself, in order that it may ultimately arrive at the form of economy which ensures, together with the greatest expansion of the productive powers of social labour, the most complete development of man”.¹ (Emphasis added.—V.S. and V.B.) Marx was well aware of the fact that the Slavic, North European peoples and the nomadic peoples of Asia and Africa, for example, had passed from the communal-tribal system to feudalism, by-passing the slave-owning formation.

Thus, from very early times history has repeatedly provided concrete examples showing that one or another people could by-pass one or another socio-economic formation in its development. However, only on one condition: it was necessary that the formation which was to

¹ Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 313.

be by-passed in one or another country had exhausted its progressive possibilities from the standpoint of world social development and that a higher social system was already in existence in the world.

The arguments of the enemies of the non-capitalist way of development are unscientific precisely because they fail to take into account the profound revolutionary changes that have taken place in world social development. As Professor R. A. Ulyanovsky rightly notes, they do not take into account "...the unique position of the former colonial countries who won independence in an era when socialism had become the main force of world development. This factor opens up to the so-called Third World new and as yet historically untried possibilities for social progress. The attempt to unconditionally reduce the contradictory development of young states to either capitalism or socialism ignores the great diversity of transitional steps and stages which, while lacking complete qualitative definiteness, are capable of creating the possibilities and prerequisites for socialist transformations."¹

Human society is constantly developing, and as it develops, it changes. Moreover, social development proceeds at a constantly accelerating rate. Therefore, every revolutionary who wants to become a Marxist-Leninist must always remember the following words of Lenin: "To ignore the changes which have taken place ... and to continue advocating the old solutions given by Marxism, would mean being true to the letter but not to the spirit of the teaching, would mean repeating the old conclusions by rote, without being able to use the Marxist method of research to analyse the new political situation."²

The works of Marx and Engels are a brilliant example of this kind of dialectical analysis of historical facts and scientific prevision of possible ways of social development for different countries and peoples. Statements to the effect that Marx and Engels never raised the question

¹ R. A. Ulyanovsky, "The Leninist Conception of Non-Capitalist Development Today". See *Voprosy istorii* No. 4, 1970, p. 119.

² V. I. Lenin, "The National Question in Our Programme", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 458.

of non-capitalist development are groundless. Let us turn to their works. In an article "On Social Relations in Russia", Engels admitted the possibility of a transition of the Russian commune to socialism, by-passing capitalist development. He wrote that "the possibility undeniably exists of raising this form of society to a higher one ... without it being necessary for the Russian peasants to go through the intermediate stage of bourgeois small holdings".¹ In 1882, in their preface to the second Russian edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Marx and Engels raised this question: "...Can the Russian *obshchina*, though greatly undermined, yet a form of the primeval common ownership of land, pass directly to the higher form of communist common ownership? Or, on the contrary, must it first pass through the same process of dissolution as constitutes the historical evolution of the West?

"The only answer to that possible today is this: If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that both complement each other, the present Russian common ownership of land may serve as the starting-point for a communist development."² In 1894, Engels extended this conclusion to all economically backward countries in which pre-capitalist relations prevailed. In the afterword to his work, "On Social Relations in Russia", he wrote that "... it is not only possible but inescapable that once the proletariat wins out and the means of production pass into common ownership among the West European nations, the countries which have just managed to make a start on capitalist production, and where tribal institutions or relics of them are still intact, will be able to use these relics of communal ownership and the corresponding popular customs as a powerful means of considerably shortening their advance to socialist society and largely sparing themselves the sufferings and the struggles through which we in Western Europe have to make our

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1973, p. 395.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, pp. 100-01.

way.... And this applies not only to Russia but to all countries at the pre-capitalist stage of development."¹

Consequently, Marx and Engels did not exclude the possibility of the transition of backward countries to socialism, by-passing the capitalist stage of development, but conditioned this transition on the victory of socialist revolutions in the more developed capitalist countries.

History injected its corrections into the theoretical propositions of Marx and Engels. Firstly, capitalism, with all its inherent contradictions, began to develop quickly in Russia. Secondly, the socialist revolution won out earlier in Russia than in the West European countries. These corrections of history do not in the least depreciate the brilliant ideas of the founders of Marxism regarding the possibility of a transition by separate countries and peoples to socialism, by-passing the capitalist stage of development. The value of these ideas for the peoples of Asia and Africa has been repeatedly substantiated by life itself.

LENIN'S ELABORATION OF THE CONCEPTION OF NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT

Under the conditions extant in the 19th century, when the socialist revolution has not yet won out in any country, the founders of Marxism could not, of course, describe the concrete forms and content of non-capitalist development. As Marx and Engels foresaw and as history confirmed, the non-capitalist development of countries in which pre-capitalist relations prevail is possible only when a social system that is more progressive than capitalism, namely, the socialist system, already exists. But in his time, when it came to picturing the destiny of the backward countries of Asia and Africa, Engels had to say: "...As to what social and political phases these countries will then have to pass through before they likewise arrive at socialist organisation, I think we today can advance only rather idle hypotheses."²

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, pp. 403-04.

² Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 35.

Under new historical conditions—under the conditions prevailing on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution and after its victory—Lenin was able to enrich Marxism with new conclusions and propositions. He developed the ideas of Marx and Engels, which placed the national-colonial question in the general framework of class relations and class struggle, in a world in which capitalism was moving into its imperialist stage and the liberation struggle increasingly assumed the character of a single world process leading ultimately to the victory of socialism. Lenin pointed out that under these conditions the main content of the national-colonial problem becomes the elimination of colonial and semi-colonial oppression, and the national liberation movement becomes an integral part of the world revolutionary process.

The merger of liberation revolutions and the class struggle of the international working class into a single current, and the international support of these revolutions by the forces of victorious socialism create most important prerequisites for the transition of backward countries to socialism and for the development of a decisive struggle against imperialism.

In developing Marxism in line with the new historical conditions—the conditions of the victory of socialism in one country—Lenin formulated the theoretical proposition covering the possibility of the transition of backward peoples to socialism, by-passing capitalism. In his address at the 2nd Congress of the Comintern in 1920, he said: "The question was posed as follows: are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war? We replied in the negative. ...With the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage."¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

Lenin's conception of non-capitalist development was a discovery of immense significance for the large popular masses of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. What it amounts to essentially is that in the era of imperialism and socialist revolutions, the peoples of backward countries can achieve socialism not through capitalist development, but by-passing it or interrupting it at an early stage.

In 1916, Lenin wrote that "...most of the countries and the majority of the world's population have not even reached, or have only just reached, the capitalist stage of development".¹ In our day, too, when the basic content of the present era consists of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, there still remain all or nearly all the formations and structures known to history—from tribal relations to feudalism and capitalism at varying levels. In our day, too, nearly half of mankind—basically the Afro-Asian peoples—live under conditions in which feudal and pre-feudal relations predominate, under conditions of a weak development of capitalism, and on the Latin American continent, under conditions in which capitalist development is intertwined with the most diverse pre-capitalist agrarian relations.

Lenin's conception of non-capitalist development indissolubly links the national liberation of the colonial peoples, their liberation from imperialist dependence, with the struggle for socialism. Of great significance to countries that have taken the course towards socialism is the approach to the problem of economic backwardness that Lenin worked out. Lenin came out vigorously against absolutising the technological and economic prerequisites necessary for a socialist revolution.

As is known, Karl Kautsky and the Russian Mensheviks felt that because capitalism and the productive forces in general were relatively undeveloped in Russia, Russia was not ready for socialism and that therefore the proletarian revolution was a big mistake committed by

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 58-59.

the Bolsheviks in their attempt to "push" history. Replying to these critics in his brilliant article "Our Revolution", published in 1923, Lenin stressed that "infinitely stereotyped, for instance, is the argument they learned by rote during the development of West European Social-Democracy, namely, that we are not yet ripe for socialism, that, as certain 'learned' gentlemen among them put it, the objective economic premises for socialism do not exist in our country...".¹ Drawing on the experience of the socialist revolution in Russia, Lenin formulated one of the fundamental propositions of Marxism-Leninism on the prerequisites of the socialist revolution in the following way: "If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say just what that definite 'level of culture' is, for it differs in every West European country), why cannot we begin by first achieving the prerequisites for that definite level of culture in a revolutionary way, and *then*, with the aid of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations?" Lenin concluded the article with a remarkable example of foresight: "Our European philistines never even dream that the subsequent revolutions in Oriental countries, which possess much vaster populations and a much vaster diversity of social conditions, will undoubtedly display even greater distinctions than the Russian revolution."²

Thus, Lenin established the fact that one or another economic level—be it even the highest level of development of productive forces and labour productivity—is not the determining prerequisite with which the replacement of one social system by another must necessarily begin, and that such replacement can begin with the revolutionary seizure of political power, with the creation by revolutionary means of the prerequisites for the attainment of this necessary level under the new political system. In other words, the national-democratic revolution and its development into a socialist revolution

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Our Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 477-78.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 478-79, 480.

is the way that permits countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke to carry out the transition to socialism, by-passing the capitalist stage of development or interrupting the process of capitalist development.

Organic components of the Leninist conception of non-capitalist development are Lenin's theoretical propositions on the role of the peasant masses in the countries of Asia and Africa and the work of Communists among these masses; on the progressive role of revolutionary democrats; on the rate of non-capitalist development of economically backward countries; on transforming revolutionary-democratic parties into Marxist parties; and on applying the principles of scientific socialism to the specific conditions of newly independent countries.

The foes of non-capitalist development often accuse those who support Lenin's conception of this development of not taking into account the distinctive features of the countries of Asia and Africa, where the number of proletarian elements is small, the workers' movement is weak and there is no broad social base for the activity of Communist parties.

Lenin was well acquainted with the situation in the countries of Asia and Africa. In a report to the 2nd Congress of the Communist International he said that "the preponderance of pre-capitalist relationships is still the main determining feature in these countries, so that there can be no question of a purely proletarian movement in them. There is practically no industrial proletariat in these countries." However, he proceeded from the fact that "the idea of Soviet organisation is a simple one, and can be applicable, not only to proletarian, but also to peasant feudal and semi-feudal relations".¹

Lenin repeatedly returned to the idea of adapting the principles of the proletarian state to the conditions of backward peoples. In his remarks on A. Sultan Zade's report "On the Prospects of the Socialist Revolution", he noted that "it was necessary to ...*adjust* both Soviet institutions and the Communist Party (its membership,

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 242-43.

special tasks) to the level of the *peasant* countries of the colonial East. This is the crux of the matter. This needs thinking about and *seeking concrete* answers."¹

The experience of the peoples of the Soviet East and North provided the answer to this problem. Concrete forms were found of *adjusting* the principles of socialist construction to the conditions of backward peoples who were at a pre-capitalist level of development. In an address to the 2nd Congress of Communist Organisations of the East, Lenin laid down the following guidelines: "...Relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, you must adapt yourselves to specific conditions such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not against capitalism. That is a difficult and specific task.... You must find specific forms for this alliance of the foremost proletarians of the world with the labouring and exploited masses of the East whose conditions are in many cases medieval...."²

Accordingly, Lenin's conclusion was that the principles of scientific socialism were fully applicable to the countries of Asia and Africa. He also worked out the methodology of their use for the progressive forces of these countries. Lenin taught that due to the existence of national differences, the unevenness in the levels of economic and cultural development, the character of traditions and other features, the principles of scientific socialism should be applied in such a way as would "...*correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions".³

Lenin pointed out that Communists can work successfully with representatives of the peasant masses who

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Draft Decision for the Plenum of C.C., R.C.P.(B.)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 202.

² V. I. Lenin, "2nd Congress of Communist Organisations of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 161-62.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing' Communism—An Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.

are carriers of bourgeois nationalism. He stressed the progressive role of revolutionary democrats in the countries of Asia and Africa, and called on Communists to seek an alliance with those of them who "turn towards the proletariat",¹ to help them rid themselves of the burden of petty-bourgeois prejudices and facilitate their going over to positions of scientific socialism. In his article "Democracy and Narodism in China", Lenin, referring to the democratic programme of Sun Yat-sen, wrote that revolutionary democrats "...are subjectively socialists because they are opposed to oppression and exploitation of the masses".²

The development of the revolutionary process in Asia and Africa fully confirms this conclusion. In scope and social depth, the national-democratic revolution in many African countries goes far beyond the limits of a purely anti-colonial revolution. Ruling revolutionary-democratic parties have already begun working towards the political and economic liberation of their countries from imperialism. They are making progress in liquidating the positions of the imperialist monopolies, creating a progressive national economy on the basis of developing the state sector, overcoming the colonial legacy in the sphere of socio-economic relations, and solving the agrarian question in the interests of the peasantry.

Lenin advanced a number of concrete propositions on the character of non-capitalist development. He saw as one of the main features of this development the fact that it was "a slower, more cautious and more systematic transition to socialism...".³ This conclusion of Lenin's is obviously ignored by the present "Leftists" in the Maoist leadership of the Chinese Communist Party who are trying to get the countries that have set out on the road of non-capitalist development to carry out socialist transformations without creating the economic, social

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing' Communism—An Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 75.

² V. I. Lenin, "Democracy and Narodism in China", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 166.

³ V. I. Lenin, "To the Communists of the Caucasus", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 317.

and other prerequisites necessary for this, which can only do serious damage to the cause of social progress in these countries.

According to Lenin, non-capitalist development is a whole transitional stage in itself, a multi-stage progressive revolutionary process of carrying out anti-imperialist and democratic transformations that step by step bring a country up to the point of building a socialist society.

Such are the fundamental principles of the Leninist conception of the non-capitalist way of development—a conception that has made an outstanding contribution to the theory of scientific socialism.

THE CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LENINIST CONCEPTION OF NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT AND ITS APPLICATION IN PRACTICE

Lenin foresaw that the development of the revolutionary process in Asia, Africa and Latin America would set ever new questions before the theory of scientific socialism which Marxists-Leninists would have to answer. He stressed that the oppressed nations would "contribute something of their own to the different *forms* of democracy, the different *forms* of transition to socialism",¹ and called on Marxists-Leninists to contribute to the further creative elaboration of the theory and practice of non-capitalist development. This task was taken up by all Marxist-Leninist parties, the entire body of progressive world social science.

The Communist International made a big contribution to the development of the theory of scientific socialism. It gave a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis of international development in the period after the October Revolution up to the Second World War. At the Sixth Congress of the Comintern in 1929, important conclusions were formulated on fundamental questions of the national liberation movement, and the objective possibility of

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 70.

non-capitalist development of backward countries was stressed.¹ At that time, the Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia were developing along the non-capitalist road.

The 1950s and beginning of the 1960s saw a rapid disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism and the formation of new independent states. The young states were faced with the problem of choosing the way of their socio-economic development.

In 1960, a Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties made a profound study and analysis of the situation in the Third World countries, and came to the conclusion that these countries would not be able to solve their most complex and urgent problems along the lines of development towards capitalism. The Meeting stressed in its declaration: "The people, however, begin to see that the best way to abolish age-long backwardness and improve their living standard is that of non-capitalist development."²

The international forum of Communists pointed out in its documents that at the present stage of the national liberation movement the most advisable form of non-capitalist development is the national-democratic state which expresses the will of a "single national-democratic front and all the patriotic forces of the nation". This conclusion was an important contribution to the creative development of the Leninist conception of non-capitalist development.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in June 1969 noted: "Under the impact of the revolutionary conditions of our time, distinctive forms of progressive social development of the newly free countries have appeared, and the role of revolutionary and democratic forces has been enhanced."³

¹ Stenographic Report of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. Issue 4, Moscow, 1929, p. 6 (in Russian).

² Documents of Meetings of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties Held in Moscow in November 1957, in Bucharest in June 1960, and in Moscow in November 1960, Moscow, 1963, p. 64.

³ International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 28.

Addressing the Meeting, General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev said that "a start has been made in a fundamentally new direction for the development of the newly independent countries".¹ The Meeting underscored the fact that "in the past decade the role of the anti-imperialist movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the world revolutionary process has continued to grow. In some countries, this movement is acquiring an anti-capitalist content." And further, that "social differentiation is developing in the newly independent countries. There is a sharpening conflict between the working class, the peasantry and other democratic forces, including patriotic-minded sections of the petty bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and, on the other, imperialism and the forces of domestic reaction." The Meeting described the non-capitalist way of development as one that ensured the possibility of creating "conditions for transition to socialist development".²

At the end of March and beginning of April 1971, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held its 24th Congress. The Leninist conception of non-capitalist development found further creative elaboration in the Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, in the resolutions of the Congress and in the addresses of the delegates. The Congress based its conclusions on the experience in non-capitalist development already attained by a number of countries of Asia and Africa. The Report of the CC CPSU to the Congress noted: "...It is no easy thing to bring about a radical restructuring of backward social relations on non-capitalist principles, and in an atmosphere of unceasing attacks by the neo-colonialists and domestic reactionaries. This makes it all the more important that despite all these difficulties the states taking the socialist orientation have been further advancing along their chosen

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 173.

² International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, pp. 27, 28.

path."¹ Pointing out that the formation and strengthening of the world socialist system has been a powerful accelerator of historical progress, as a result of which fresh prospects have opened up for the triumph of socialism all over the world, the 24th Congress of the CPSU stressed the vital importance of following a consistent Leninist course towards further strengthening the fraternal international alliance between the forces of world socialism and those of the national liberation movement.

In the last decade, the problems of non-capitalist development have become one of the central areas of study in the field of Marxist-Leninist social science. They have been repeatedly examined at scientific meetings organised by the journal *World Marxist Review*, which has published a number of articles devoted to the Leninist conception of the non-capitalist path and its creative development. In May 1969, the Communist Party of Great Britain conducted a scientific conference of Marxists-Leninists on the problems of the paths of development of backward countries. A great deal of attention was paid to these problems in October of that same year at the international symposium in Alma Ata devoted to the centenary of the birth of V. I. Lenin. In August 1971, an international seminar was held in Frunze on the theme, "The Experience of Agrarian Transformations in the Republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and Its Significance for Newly Independent Countries". In September 1971, an international conference of Africanists from the socialist countries was held in Varna (Bulgaria), at which the problems of non-capitalist development were discussed.

One of the conclusions drawn from the analyses and studies made at these conferences and symposiums is that there are three main examples of countries developing along non-capitalist lines. They are:

— the Central Asian republics of the Soviet Union, which followed a non-capitalist path and built a socialist society within the framework of a single multinational socialist state with the direct and all-round

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1974, p. 24.

assistance of the victorious Russian working class and the working class of the other Soviet socialist republics;

— the Mongolian People's Republic, which had a common border and a Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Friendship with the USSR, was not dependent on the world capitalist market, and in which socialist transformations were made under the leadership of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, standing on positions of Marxism-Leninism;

— the countries of Asia and Africa that have embarked upon the non-capitalist road of development. Having freed themselves from colonial oppression, these countries still find themselves in strong economic dependence on the world capitalist market. Leadership in the non-capitalist development of these countries is provided by the forces of national revolutionary democracy, which come close on a number of fundamental questions to the positions of scientific socialism.

Each of the above-listed examples of ways of non-capitalist development has its own characteristic features, and each of the peoples of these countries has made its own contribution to the implementation of socio-economic changes, whose content determined the forms, scope and rate of its country's development. Nonetheless, certain common features and regularities can be observed in the development of all these groups of countries. Soviet science attaches great importance to the study of these regularities.

Among those working in the area in recent years have been Academician B. N. Ponomaryov, V. L. Tyagunenko, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Professor R. A. Uyanovsky, D. Sc. (Econ.). These scholars have made a big contribution to the theoretical elaboration of a number of Marxist propositions of the Leninist conception of non-capitalist development. Let us consider, briefly, the works of Professor R. A. Uyanovsky, notable for his profound knowledge of the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, his dialectical and creative approach to the complex social phenomena of contemporary life in Asia and Africa, and his ability to see the general trend of development. His "Scientific Socialism

and the Liberated Countries" (1968), "On Some Questions of the Non-Capitalist Development of the Countries of Asia and Africa" (1969), "The Leninist Conception of Non-Capitalist Development Today" (1970), and "On the Marxist Attitude Towards Non-Marxist Socialism in the Developing Countries" (1971), have received broad and positive response from among the progressive public of the Third World countries. Characterising the non-capitalist way at the present stage, Ulyanovsky writes in *World Marxist Review* that the Marxist conception of this development assumes that the political forces and countries that have chosen the non-capitalist way are oriented towards socialism, are heading towards socialism, but are not yet building socialism today because the objective and subjective prerequisites for this—social, economic, cultural and political—have not yet taken shape. The non-capitalist way at this stage means carrying out far-reaching, general democratic changes in a consistently revolutionary manner, with socialism as the long-range goal. Development along these lines, far from raising more obstacles to the subsequent transition to the socialist stage, paves the way for it. Leadership in effecting non-capitalist changes is provided by national revolutionary democrats, who generally have a radical petty-bourgeois origin. They do not follow Marxist-Leninist ideology in its entirety even though they have borrowed much from it and have learned much. Most important of all, many of them show, under the impact of historical development, a willingness to learn, to continue drawing nearer to scientific socialism.

Non-capitalist development is neither universal nor obligatory for all Afro-Asian countries. But insofar as this transitional stage has become a historical reality in some of them and is the main prospect of social progress for them, it is historically inevitable that revolutionary national-democratic ideology in one form or another should play a decisive and, moreover, progressive role there for a long time to come.¹

¹ See *World Marxist Review*, 1971, Vol. 14, No. 9 p. 39.

The Marxist-Leninist conception of non-capitalist development functions as a progressive, revolutionary theory in the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. It is being translated into life today in many of these countries. Many progressive leaders and parties in developing countries are using the experience of the Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia as a guide for building a new life and finding answers to burning questions that arise.

THE EXPERIENCE IN NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS AND MONGOLIA

Asian and African countries with a socialist orientation are now acquiring experience in non-capitalist development. The Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia, however, have already gone through the non-capitalist stage and have built a socialist society, accumulating in the process a great deal of experience that is of tremendous international significance. They were the first to demonstrate in actual practice that peoples, regardless of what stage of socio-economic development they have reached, can effect a transition to socialism, by-passing capitalism.

As we noted in the first chapter, the non-capitalist development of the Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia differed from the non-capitalist development now taking place in certain Asian and African countries, both in social content and the conditions under which it proceeded.

In the early 1920s, when the Central Asian republics and the MPR were going over to the non-capitalist road of development, the Soviet Union was the only country in the world that was building socialism. It was still in the process of creating a socialist economy and had no experience in socialist construction. Its international position was exceedingly difficult and it had to build socialism under conditions of capitalist encirclement. However, the Central Asian republics were in the system of a single socialist state, and Communist parties functioned within them. The Soviet socialist state safeguarded the

security of the peoples of these republics from external and internal enemies. The more highly developed Soviet republics (the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR and others) gave them all-round assistance—economic, financial and in personnel. Economic development proceeded at a faster pace in the Central Asian republics than in the other regions of the country, enabling the peoples living there to rapidly raise their economic and cultural level. At the same time, this helped to create the material and technical prerequisites for the simultaneous victory of socialism throughout the USSR.

Mongolia's non-capitalist development was also characterised by extensive all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union. The Soviet peoples gave Mongolia international support in the economic, political and military spheres, and the country was freed from dependence on the capitalist market. The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party maintained close ties with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Asian and African countries with a socialist orientation are in many respects in a different situation. For example, they are not divorced from the system of the international capitalist division of labour and many of them are still economically dependent on the capitalist market. This, of course, creates serious impediments to the creation of the material and other prerequisites for building socialism.

There are other difficulties in the struggle for socialism that are specific to the countries of Asia and Africa. The whole process of people becoming aware of the ideology of scientific socialism and of these countries' revolutionary-democratic parties going over to its positions is made more complex by the strong pressure exerted by world imperialism and the fact that internal and external reactionary forces make wide use of a nationalistic ideology in their fight against the forces of socialism.

However, the specific features of non-capitalist development in the countries of Asia and Africa can in no way prevent their making use of the experience of socialist transformations in the Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia. Lenin underlined the fact that "this expe-

rience ... cannot be taken away, no matter how difficult the vicissitudes the Russian revolution and the international socialist revolution may pass through. It has gone down in history as socialism's gain, and on it the future world revolution will erect its socialist edifice."¹

The Soviet Central Asian republics have scored outstanding successes in the development of their economy, culture and science. In this lies the great power of their example, a fact that even some ideologists and propagandists of imperialism have had to admit. For example, Zvi Rudy, a West German bourgeois scholar, acknowledges that the Communist Party and the Soviet state "have moved dozens of peoples into the historical arena, including peoples who would apparently have disappeared from the face of the earth were it not for the emergence of the Soviet regime.... From a semi-feudal, semi-patriarchal stage of development, from age-old backwardness and a nomadic life they were brought onto the road of economic and social progress."²

The number of revolutionary-democratic parties and progressive leaders who are studying the Soviet experience is growing. It is not a question of mechanically transferring or blindly copying the rich experience of the Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia, but rather a question of grasping its essence and seeking out that which is applicable to the concrete conditions of the newly independent countries and can facilitate their struggle for economic and social progress, for socialism. Lenin wrote: "To seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle a *single* international task ... such is the basic task in the historical period that all the advanced countries (and not they alone) are going through."³

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Speech at the First Congress of Economic Councils", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 443.

² Von Zvi Rudy, "Nationalitätenproblem und Nationalitätenpolitik in der UdSSR" in: *Zeitschrift für Politik*, Köln-Berlin, September 1962, Heft 3, S. 233.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 34, p. 92.

THE SOVIET CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS' LEVEL OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF THE NON-CAPITALIST STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT

In August 1971, at an international scientific seminar in Frunze devoted to the study of the Soviet eastern republics' experience in agrarian transformations, Jama Rabille, General Director of the Ministry of State Planning of Somalia, stated: "The Soviet republics have attained the level of modern states, but my country is about at the stage they were at on the eve of the October Socialist Revolution. In today's republics of Central Asia I see the future of our country."¹

The attractiveness of the Soviet experience in non-capitalist development is enhanced by the fact that the relatively recent past of the republics of the Soviet East was in many ways similar to the present of the newly independent countries, and that their socio-economic structure was approximately the same as that of many of these countries at the beginning of their independent existence. In 1917, of the 65,000,000 non-Russian population in Russia, about 25,000,000 were at pre-capitalist stages of development, preserving a tribal way of life and semi-patriarchal and feudal modes of production.² The greater part of this population lived in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, which in the second half of the 19th century had been turned into colonies of the tsarist Russian Empire.

The basic exploiter in the Central Asian village was the *bai*, a combination of wealthy peasant and petty feudal lord who ran his household using basically the labour of metayers (*chairikers*) and to a lesser extent of hired workers (*mardikers* and others). The *bais* used primarily pre-capitalist methods of exploiting the peasant (metayage rent, usury, etc.). In 1916, over 60 per cent of the settled agriculture in Turkestan consisted of poor peasants' farms, 24.4 per cent were middle peasant farms, 13 per cent, *bai* households, and 0.1 per cent were holdings

¹ *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 27, 1971.

² *Fundamentals of Scientific Communism*, Moscow, 1966, p. 279 (in Russian).

of the large landowner type. Over 30 per cent of the rural population led a nomadic way of life, and 11.2 per cent of the nomads owned no livestock. At the same time, the feudal lords and *bais* owned 35 to 40 per cent of all the livestock.¹ In the livestock-raising mountain and steppe regions, the tribal organisation was strongly entrenched, while in the Bukhara Emirate and the Khiva Khanate feudal production relations were dominant, and the respective rulers had virtually unlimited powers over their subjects.

The intertwining tribal, communal and patriarchal-feudal relations in Central Asia and Kazakhstan were complicated by the oppression of Russian capital. The Russian colonisers seized the best land and rented it out to local peasants or made it available to settlers. Huge tracts of land belonged to the tsarist government and to the tsar himself. In the Bairam-Ali region, Nicholas I had his own personal estate consisting of 104,000 *dessiatinas* of fertile land, for the irrigation of which several dams and reservoirs were built on the Murghab river. This land was rented out, but renters were obliged to grow only cotton on it and sell it at low prices to cotton-ginning and cotton-oil enterprises.²

The development of capitalism in tsarist Russia had some effect on the colonial outskirts. Small-scale commodity production and commodity-money relations developed in the Central Asian villages and feudal methods of exploitation intertwined with capitalist methods. However, by the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution, over two million of the primarily Turkic population remained totally untouched by the capitalist stage of development. The peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan had virtually no industrial proletariat of their own. Most of them remained enmeshed in the net of feudal dependence, engaged in cattle raising and preserved their patriarchal-tribal way of life. Their economic and cultural level was extremely low. Poverty, hunger and illiteracy prevailed. According to the census of 1897, the rate of illi-

¹ Soviet Kirghizia, August 24, 1971.

² B. Ovezov, *Along Lenin's Path*, Ashkhabad, 1964, p. 15 (in Russian).

teracy among the rural population of the Russian Empire was 80.4 per cent; among the Tajiks, however, it was 99.5 per cent; the Kirghiz—99.4 per cent; the Turkmens—99.3 per cent; the Kazakhs—98 per cent; and the Uzbeks—98.4 per cent.¹

Tsarism pursued a reactionary, colonial policy with respect to the peoples of Central Asia. The 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) gave the following description of the tsarist government's policy in the national outskirts of Russia: "The policy of tsarism, the policy of the landowners and the bourgeoisie towards these peoples, consisted in killing any sprouts of statehood among them, crippling their culture, hampering their language, and holding them in ignorance.... The results of this policy were the underdevelopment and political backwardness of these peoples."²

But the oppressed peoples of Central Asia were not alone. The Russian revolutionary democrats and the entire progressive public of Russia were their unselfish friends. Standing on their side was the democratic Russia of workers, peasants and progressive intelligentsia. In their struggle for national and social liberation, the peoples of Central Asia found a staunch ally in the Russian revolutionary proletariat, led by Lenin.

GREAT OCTOBER OPENED UP THE NON-CAPITALIST ROAD OF DEVELOPMENT

The Great October Socialist Revolution was a turning point in the life of all peoples, including the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. It brought the Central Asian peoples out onto the road of social development, which took them from feudal and semi-feudal relations to socialism, by-passing the capitalist stage of development.

The major prerequisites for non-capitalist development of these peoples were the solution of the national question

¹ G. D. Krikheli, *Against the Falsification of the Nationalities Policy of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1964, pp. 23-24 (in Russian).

² *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and CC Plenums*, Part I, Moscow, 1953, pp. 558-59 (in Russian).

and the establishment of national statehood. National self-determination provided the political conditions necessary for their all-round economic and cultural development, accelerated the process of class differentiation, and facilitated the elimination of their actual inequality.

In the former Russian Empire, many peoples had been deprived of statehood. The tsarist government pursued a policy of preserving the *disunity* of the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, striving to impede the development of national self-consciousness and the growth of the national liberation movement. The areas inhabited by Uzbeks, Tajiks, Turkmens, Kirghiz, and Kazakhs were divided up into administrative districts without regard to the ethnic principle. These peoples were subjected to national oppression by tsarism and the Russian bourgeoisie.

The Great October Socialist Revolution implemented one of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism: to abolish national oppression, to establish equality and friendship among peoples, it is necessary to destroy the capitalist system of exploitation of man by man with its private capitalist ownership of the means of production. In other words, to abolish oppression, the system engendering that oppression must be abolished. "In proportion," wrote Marx and Engels, "as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."¹

Socialism in any country is impossible unless the working people of all nationalities have a unity of interests, and this unity is achieved by destroying the property relations existing under capitalism, relations which make for the exploitation of man by man and of peoples by peoples. Socialism replaces private capitalist ownership of the means of production by state and public ownership, and transforms small private ownership of the means of

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 125.

production by peasants, handicraftsmen and artisans into cooperative socialist property. In this way the economic basis of inequality among people is abolished.

Lenin pointed out that the Communist Party cannot limit itself to the declaration of formal equality, but must also ensure the equality of peoples in fact. This, he stressed, is what consistent proletarian internationalism implies. Explaining the essence of the Marxist approach to the national-colonial question, Lenin wrote that Marxists demand freedom and independence, "*i.e.*, freedom of secession for the oppressed nations, not because we have dreamt of splitting up the country economically, or of the ideal of small states, but, on the contrary, because we want large states and the closer unity and even fusion of nations, only on a truly democratic, truly internationalist basis, which is *inconceivable* without the freedom to secede."¹

Proceeding from these Marxist-Leninist propositions, the Soviet Government issued on November 2 (15), 1917, its historic Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, which stated that the Soviet Government made the following principles the basis of its nationalities policy:

1. Equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia;
2. Right of the peoples of Russia to self-determination, up to and including secession and establishment of independent states;
3. Annulment of all national and religio-national privileges and restrictions;
4. Free development of national minorities and ethnic groups inhabiting the territory of Russia.²

Another important document declaring the equality of all peoples was the Appeal of the Council of People's Commissars to the Toiling Muslims of Russia and the East of November 20 (December 3), 1917. Confirming the right of nations to self-determination, the Soviet Govern-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 413-14.

² *Documents of the Foreign Policy of the USSR*, Vol. 1, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1957, pp. 14-15 (in Russian).

ment declared: "Arrange your national life freely and without hindrance. You have the right to this. Know that your rights, just as the rights of all the peoples of Russia, are guarded by the entire power of the revolution and its organs...."

"On our banners we bring liberation to the oppressed peoples of the world...."

"We look to you for sympathy and support on this road to a new world."¹

The victory of the October Socialist Revolution and the declaration of new principles of relations between peoples, based on the ideas of proletarian internationalism, made a tremendous impact on the oppressed peoples of the East, inspiring them to struggle for national and social liberation. Upon the victory of Soviet power in Turkestan, the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Republic was immediately established, forming part of the Russian Soviet Federation. Its creation was an important step in national-state construction in Central Asia. The Kazakh ASSR was proclaimed in 1920, and then the Uzbek, Tajik, Turkmen and Kirghiz peoples attained national statehood within the framework of the Soviet state. Later, in the course of socialist construction, the Uzbek, Turkmen, Kazakh, Kirghiz and Tajik Soviet republics were formed and voluntarily joined the USSR.

The peoples of the Soviet East received invaluable assistance in establishing their national statehood from Party organisations and from experienced Party workers who were sent to the Central Asian regions by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federation. The latter helped in the tasks of setting up Soviets of Deputies and drawing broad segments of the working people into their work. Lenin saw the mass organisation of working people into Soviets as the political form of non-capitalist development of backward peoples. "It has ... been definitely established," he wrote, "that the idea of the Soviets is understood by the mass of the working people in even the most remote nations, that

¹ *Documents of the Foreign Policy of the USSR*, Vol. 1, p. 34.

the Soviets should be adapted to the conditions of a pre-capitalist social system...."¹

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties of the republics of the Soviet East faced some extremely complicated tasks: to stir the masses of working people to political activity, to make possible their participation in building a new life, to find for this purpose the right forms of close contact with the working people of each nation in their struggle against the feudal lords and bourgeois elements, and to forge a fraternal alliance with the victorious Russian proletariat. Lenin devoted special attention to the question of accelerating the rise of the material and cultural level of these peoples. He stressed: "In one way or another, by one's attitude or by concessions, it is necessary to compensate the non-Russians for the lack of trust, for the suspicion and the insults to which the government of the 'dominant' nation subjected them in the past."²

As early as May 1918, Lenin signed a decree "On the Allocation of 50,000,000 Rubles for Irrigation Work in Turkestan and on the Organisation of This Work". In 1920, equipment for several textile mills and a number of other enterprises was sent from central Russia. The Central Asian republics were awarded large credits, and their state budgets received subsidies from the Union budget. The Communist Party made provisions for a faster rate of economic development in Central Asia than elsewhere in the Union. The result was that by 1962, industrial production in Kazakhstan and Kirghizia had grown 72-fold and 73-fold, respectively, over the 1913 level, as compared with a 48-fold increase in the Soviet Union as a whole. Special importance was attached to the problem of training national cadres. Between 1926 and 1959, the growth rate in the number of metalworkers in Central Asia was twice as high as in the Soviet Union as a whole; of chemical industry workers eight times as high; of machinists, chauffeurs, tractor drivers and combine operators, approx-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

² V. I. Lenin, "Question of Nationalities or 'Autonomisation'", *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 608.

imately 2.5 times as high; of engineers, technicians and agronomists, more than twice as high; and of scientific workers, three times as high.¹ Addressing an international scientific seminar in August 1971 in Frunze, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia T. U. Usubaliyev said: "I want especially to stress that the CPSU has always followed and continues to pursue a policy of creating favourable conditions for the accelerated socio-economic and cultural progress of formerly backward peoples. Today we have every reason to declare the national question solved, but behind this lay years of intensive work."²

The Great October Socialist Revolution opened up for backward countries and peoples a new progressive road of social development towards socialism. It put an end to imperialism's monopoly position in the world and created the Soviet state of workers and peasants, thus making the path towards the social restructuring of backward countries a reality.

ABOLITION OF COLONIALISM AND FEUDALISM

The primary task of the new power in the Central Asian republics was to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism and feudalism. Otherwise it would have been impossible to begin effecting profound economic and socio-political changes along socialist lines.

The abolishment of the colonial system in Central Asia and Kazakhstan began during the October Socialist Revolution in Russia. It found practical expression above all in the granting of national statehood to the peoples of these regions and the transfer of power to Soviets of Working People's Deputies. At the same time measures were taken to eliminate the aftermath of colonialist practices in agriculture.

The tsarist regime, as a rule, had taken over the most fertile lands, pushing the local livestock raisers into the deserts and mountains and sharply reducing the area available for seasonal pastures. The practice of displac-

¹ P. M. Rogachyov, M. A. Sverdlin, *Nation—People—Mankind*, Moscow, 1967, p. 105 (in Russian).

² *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 24, 1971.

ing the boundaries of land use, blocking roads used for cattle driving and cutting off approaches to watering places deprived the nomadic cattle breeders of the best pastures. Analysing the agrarian policy of tsarism in the East, Lenin wrote: "The land for resettlement is obtained as a result of flagrant violation of the land rights of the native inhabitants."¹

In carrying out its colonial policy, tsarism drew on the support of local feudal lords and tribal chieftains to convert Central Asia and Kazakhstan into a source of raw materials and markets for developing Russian capitalism. Seizure of the best land and inequitable land tenure not only retarded the development of agriculture but also complicated the relationships between nationalities. In this connection Lenin wrote that it was necessary "...to win the confidence of the natives; to win it over again and again; to prove that we are *not* imperialists, that we shall *not* tolerate any deviation in that direction.

"This is a world-wide question, and that is no exaggeration.

"There you must be especially strict.

"It will have an effect on India and the East; it is no joke..."²

A resolution, "On the Tasks of the Party in the National Question", adopted by the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1920, pointed out that the land of the Kazakhs, Kirghiz and a number of peoples of Turkestan and other colonial outskirts "served until recently as the object of colonisation by Russian settlers, who succeeded in grabbing from them the best arable land and systematically forced them into barren deserts. The policy of tsarism, the policy of the landowners and the bourgeoisie, consisted in planting in these regions as many as possible kulak elements from among the Russian peasantry and Cossacks and turning them into a dependable support for its great-power aspirations." To help these peoples of the former tsarist colonies eliminate remaining injustices, the Congress called on the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Problem of Resettlement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 96.

² V. I. Lenin, "To A. A. Joffe", *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 298.

Party "to unite their efforts with the efforts of the working masses of the local Russian population in the struggle for liberation from the kulaks, in general, and the predatory Great-Russian kulaks, in particular; to help them in every way possible to cast off the kulak-colonialists from their backs and thereby provide themselves with usable land necessary for human existence."¹

Pursuing this just policy, the Soviet governments of the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan began in 1921 to carry out the first land and water reform. Its chief aim was to stamp out the remains of colonialism.

Before the reform began, more than a thousand former tsarist agents, gendarmes, police and other servants of the colonisers were ousted from the Turkestan Republic. The reform itself entailed confiscating land from kulak-colonialist elements that were most hostile to the Soviet system. A total of 232,331 *dessiatinas* of land were turned over to the peasants of the Turkestan Republic. In the course of the reform, 8,084 large farmsteads were eliminated that had arbitrarily and illegally seized plots from peasants of the native population.²

The 1921-22 land and water reform was a major step in implementing the Leninist agrarian programme in the unique conditions of the Soviet East. In its goals, tasks and results it constituted a revolutionary-democratic transformation. Like other land reforms of the 1920s, it was one of the socio-political prerequisites for the building of socialism in the *aul* and *kishlak*. Success was ensured by the fact that the class principle was strictly observed in taking over land held by colonialist elements and distributing it. This approach to the needs of the peasants from a class position strengthened the friendship and cohesion of the masses of peasants of all nationalities. As a revolutionary measure, the reform significantly raised the level of class consciousness and political activi-

¹ *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and CC Plenums*, Vol. 2, 8th Russ. ed., Moscow, 1970, pp. 246-56.

² Materials of the Seminar, "The Experience of Agrarian Transformations in the Republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and Its Significance for Newly Independent Countries", Frunze, August 1971, p. 8 (in Russian).

ty of the peasant masses. It abolished the privileges of colonialist elements in the sphere of landownership and land use.

The land and water reform of 1921-22 and other reforms to be discussed later were based on the just principles of Lenin's famous Decree on Land, adopted at the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets on November 8, 1917, immediately after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The Decree abolished private ownership of land, stating that "landed proprietorship is abolished forthwith without any compensation". In accordance with the Decree, confiscated lands with all their livestock, inventoried property, buildings and appurtenances were immediately transferred to the disposition of the *volost* (district) land committees and the *uyezd* (area) Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. It directed the *uyezd* Soviets of Peasants' Deputies not only to take all necessary measures for the observance of the strictest order during the taking over of the landowners' estates, but also to ensure the revolutionary protection of all the farming property on the land, with all buildings, implements, livestock, stores of foodstuffs, etc., passing into the hands of the people. Plots of land with high-level scientific farming (orchards, plantations, nurseries, hothouses, etc.) were not subject to division, but were given over to the exclusive use of the state or communes, depending on their size and significance, and were made into model farms.¹ This, in essence, laid the basis for the organisation of state agricultural enterprises (the state farms).

In carrying out the provisions of the Decree on Land, the Soviet state effected the nationalisation of land in deed. "In this peasant country," Lenin wrote, "it was the peasantry as a whole who were the first to gain, who gained most, and gained immediately from the dictatorship of the proletariat.... For the first time the peasant has seen real freedom—freedom to eat his bread, freedom from starvation."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 5th Russ. ed., Vol. 26, pp. 226-27.

² V. I. Lenin, "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 112.

The Soviet state gave the peasants enormous material assistance. It placed 150 million hectares of land into the hands of the peasants for their free use, delivered them from the expense of purchasing land, which had amounted to 700,000,000 rubles (in gold), cancelled the agricultural population's debt to the Peasant Bank in the sum of about 1,500 million rubles, and turned over about 300,000,000 rubles' worth of former landowners' farming implements to the peasants. In conjunction with settling one of the basic problems of the socialist revolution—the problem of land ownership—the Communist Party and the Soviet state were also solving the problem of organising land tenure so as to exclude any exploitation of man by man. The Decree on Land embodied the principle of equalised land tenure, according to which land was subject to distribution among the peasants according to a labour standard or a subsistence standard, depending on local conditions. The state also granted the peasants the freedom of choice with respect to the forms of land tenure: they could leave the commune to set up separate *khutors* (farmsteads), unite by households, use the land on a community basis, etc. This question could be decided in each case at peasant meetings.

The principle of equalised land tenure is essentially a petty-bourgeois principle. Lenin and the Party repeatedly pointed out that equalised land tenure by itself, without a radical restructuring of agriculture along socialist lines, could not free the peasants from poverty and hunger. Nonetheless, this petty-bourgeois principle, having broad support among the peasant masses, was not rejected by the Marxist-Leninist Party in the period of transition to socialism. It should also be borne in mind that the material basis of socialism—a large-scale machine industry capable of also reorganising agriculture—had not yet been created. In his historic report at the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, Lenin said in regard to the principle of equalised distribution, "As a democratic government, we cannot ignore the decision of the masses of the people, even though we may disagree with it. In the fire of experience, applying the decree in practice,

and carrying it out locally, the peasants will themselves realise where the truth lies."¹

The principle of equalised distribution was also preserved in the law "On the Socialisation of the Land" (Clause 12), adopted in 1918 at the Third All-Russia Congress of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, where the conditions of its application were made even more concrete. The proletariat and its vanguard fulfilled the obligations they assumed with respect to the working peasantry, winning thereby the confidence of the absolute majority of the population and strengthening their positions. On the other hand, they knew that the most important and most effective step towards a radical change in agriculture and in the conditions of life for millions of working peasants was the abolition of private ownership of land and its being declared national property, that is, the property of the Soviet socialist state.

Under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the key positions in the national economy in the hands of Soviet power, both the embodiment of the principle of equalised land tenure in legislative documents and its practical implementation were temporary in character and could not have a serious negative effect on the course of socialist changes taking place under the leadership of the Communist Party. In time, after accumulating a certain amount of experience in using land on the basis of this principle, the working peasantry would inevitably recognise its impracticability and understand the necessity of going over to socialist forms of farming. The entire subsequent course of socialist construction in our country has confirmed the correctness of this proposition.

The Decree on Land played a great and historic role in the emergence and development of new socialist land relations. Its significance consisted not only in that, having abolished private ownership of all land and its minerals, forests and waters, it declared them to be public property, but also in that it laid the basis for new experience in land use under the conditions of the dictatorship of

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 258.

the proletariat. Realisation of the key propositions of the programme of land relations, with account taken of the specific features of the national outskirts, was of great historical moment. In the very first days of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Decree on Land was published in Central Asia and immediately became effective there. It determined the character and direction of the policy of Soviet power on the peasant and land questions. Lenin pointed out, "We regard the land question, the question of improving the living conditions of the peasants, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population, as one of fundamental importance."¹

In their work on the land question the Communist Party and the Soviet government gave due consideration to the fact that the socialist revolution was being accomplished throughout the vast territory of the former tsarist empire, inhabited by different peoples who were at different levels of socio-economic and cultural development. Lenin constantly stressed that in implementing social measures, strict account should be taken of the class correlation of forces and the degree of the peasantry's readiness for reforms. He opposed any kind of fixed pattern and attempts to dictate common forms and methods from above. "The unity of essentials, of fundamentals, of the substance," he said, "is not disturbed but ensured by *variety* in details, in specific local features, in methods of *approach*, in *methods* of exercising control."²

The specific features of effecting agrarian and all other socio-economic changes in Central Asia and Kazakhstan were determined by the concrete historical conditions prevailing at the time. There was an acute shortage of trained people devoted to the revolution; the land organs were obstructed by feudal and reactionary elements; the masses of peasants were, on the whole, politically, socially and culturally backward and still strongly in-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Speech at the Fourth Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, Ninth Convocation, October 31, 1922", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 392.

² V. I. Lenin, "How to Organise Competition?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 413.

fluenced by the tribal-clan chieftains. All this hampered the rapid and efficient implementation of progressive land reform. Thus, feudal and semi-feudal relations in these regions were abolished only gradually, in stages, over a period of more than ten years.

During the first stage (1918-20), the feudal lords, officials of the colonial administration and Russian capitalists were expropriated. At the second stage (1920-24), which we have already examined, confiscation of large feudal holdings continued, equality of rights for all nationalities was proclaimed, and the buying and selling of land and water was strictly forbidden. But the substantial mass of peasants were still landless or land-hungry, and feudal usurious and semi-capitalist exploitation still persisted in the countryside.

These problems were solved during the third stage of agrarian reform (1925-29), after the establishment within the Soviet Union of national state formations of the Kazakh, Kirghiz, Tajik, Turkmen and Uzbek peoples. Implementation of this agrarian and water reform began only after considerable preparatory work had been done in mobilising the masses of working peasants in support of reform and the masses themselves had come to realise the necessity of its implementation. In the course of these preparations, government bodies were basically purged of hostile elements and reinforced with workers dedicated to the socialist revolution.

The land and water reform of 1925-29 proceeded on a broad democratic basis. The land committees created for the purpose of carrying it out included, along with representatives of government bodies and the ruling party, representatives elected directly by the working peasants. The committees worked in close contact with the entire working peasantry and its mass organisations. This made it possible to reveal sizeable tracts of land that were concealed from the land agencies by the feudalists and other exploiting groups, and to avoid substantial errors both in the alienation of land and in allotting it to land-hungry and landless peasants.

The local land committees made up lists of farms whose land was subject to complete or partial alienation, and

also of farms which were to be allotted land. The land holdings of the following basic social groups were subject to full alienation: feudal landowners, urban capitalists, former officials of the colonial and feudal administrative apparatus, rural and urban merchants and usurers. Thus, land ownership of the non-labour type was in the main eliminated.

Land belonging to kulaks who supported the counter-revolutionary forces was also partially alienated. The first to receive a share of the alienated land and also the means and implements of production were the landless, and then the land-hungry *dehkans* (peasants). The reform was aimed at strengthening the peasant small-commodity economy. In the course of the reform, a great deal was done to build up the small-commodity sector and provide it with various forms of state assistance and cooperative services.

The land and water reform of 1925-29 saw the complete expropriation of all land belonging to feudal landlords and urban capitalists, former officials of the colonial and feudal administrative apparatus, and rural and urban merchants and usurers. Certain limits were also placed on rich kulaks who resisted the carrying out of progressive changes. The Communist Party's policy towards the middle peasants, however, was gradually and systematically to involve them in socialist construction through persuasion but not coercion.

In his report "On the Work in the Village" at the Eighth Congress of the RCP (B) in February 1920, Lenin said, "In relation to the landowners and the capitalists our aim is complete expropriation. *But we shall not tolerate any use of force in respect of the middle peasants.* Even in respect of the rich peasants we do not say as resolutely as we do of the bourgeoisie—absolute expropriation of the rich peasants and the kulaks. This distinction is made in our programme. We say that the resistance of the counter-revolutionary efforts of the rich peasants must be suppressed. That is not complete expropriation.

"The basic difference in our attitude towards the bourgeoisie and the middle peasant—complete expropriation

of the bourgeoisie and an alliance with the middle peasant who does not exploit others...."¹

Lenin paid very close attention to this question considering it to be of tremendous importance to the fate of the socialist revolution. In his "Preliminary Draft Theses on the Agrarian Question", which he prepared for the Second Congress of the Comintern, he warned the revolutionary proletariat against making rash decisions on this question. He pointed out that "the expropriation even of the big peasants can in no way be made an immediate task of the victorious proletariat, because the material, and especially the technical conditions, as well as the social conditions, for the socialisation of such farms are still lacking". For these reasons, "...the proletarian state must allow the big peasants to retain their land, confiscating it only if they resist the power of the working and exploited people."²

Of great importance in implementing the policy of the Communist Party, in organising the work of the Soviets and in correctly resolving the urgent land and national questions was the Resolution of the Politburo of the CC RCP(B) of October 14, 1921 (based on a report of the Turkburo) "On the Turkestan Questions". It outlined the ways of ensuring the active participation of the middle peasants in the socialist transformation of Turkestan, stressing the need to display special attention and consideration and carefulness towards them and always to use the method of persuasion in the matter of involving them in socialist construction.³

Democratic agrarian transformations in Uzbekistan also came about as a result of a stage-by-stage land and water reform, in the course of which all land held by landlords was confiscated and the economic and political positions of the kulaks were seriously undermined. The

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the RCP(B)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 205.

² V. I. Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses on the Agrarian Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 158.

³ *Outline History of the Communist Party of Turkestan (The Communist Party of Turkestan in the Period of Rehabilitating the National Economy. 1921-1924)*, Tashkent, 1960, p. 65 (in Russian).

reform radically altered the correlation of class forces in the countryside and paved the way for socialist transformation in agriculture.

As the economic and political conditions ripened, a total of 4,629 landed estates were confiscated in the region of Uzbekistan, and the land used by the kulak farms was significantly reduced (excess land was taken from 2,281 *bai-kulak* farms). All this made it possible to allot about 400,000 *dessiatinas* of land to 88,280 landless and land-hungry peasant households. Most of the newly established peasant households also received livestock, implements and money credits. In the Tashkent, Samarkand and Ferghana regions alone, more than 17,500 draught animals and about 47,000 sets of agricultural implements were distributed and over 3,400,000 rubles of credit was granted. The agrarian reform freed the working *dehkans* of Uzbekistan from having to pay a total of 28,600,000 rubles a year in land rent to landowners and *bais*.¹

The situation in Mongolia also called for step-by-step reforms. The immediate and complete eradication of the economic base of feudalism was not set as a task in the first years of people's power. Instead, its age-old foundations were gradually undermined as a result of which the position of the *arats* (livestock raisers) steadily improved. Serfdom and other privileges of the feudal lords were abolished in 1922, and in 1925, the class of *shabinars* (monastery serfs) was also abolished. A law passed in 1923, introduced a progressive property tax on all classes.² It provided for a higher tax rate on feudal and monastery property and created favourable conditions for the development of *arat* farms. In the mid-1920s, the Party and the People's Government went over from a policy of restricting the feudal lords to a decisive attack on their economic positions. Between 1929 and 1931, the property of more than 1,500 big feudal lords was confiscated and distributed among the poor peasants.³

¹ *Outline History of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan*, Tashkent, 1964, p. 196 (in Russian).

² *Forty Years of People's Mongolia*, Moscow, 1961, pp. 43-45 (in Russian).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

Although the agrarian reforms carried out in the 1920s in Central Asia, Kazakhstan and Mongolia were profoundly revolutionary in character, they did not solve all of the economic and social problems of the countryside. Since these reforms did not provide for the total elimination of non-labour farms (farms using hired labour and the labour of metayers), an end had not yet been put to the exploitation of man by man in all its forms. In Uzbekistan, for example, even after the agrarian reform there were still more than 100,000 people working as sharecroppers and *batraks* (farm hands), over 70,000 hectares of land remained under the metayer system and small feudal lords were still appropriating about 9,000,000 rubles a year in land rent.¹ On the other hand, more than half of the farms in Central Asia and Kazakhstan were small and inefficient. Thus, still unresolved was the important problem of creating a system of large-scale collective farming that would ensure rapid economic progress.

The Marxist-Leninist position on the socialist cooperation of peasant farms opposed both the position of Right opportunism, which is essentially against the socialist transformation of the countryside, and that of Left opportunism, which aims at socialist cooperation without the necessary preparation and violates the principle of voluntariness in uniting peasants in production cooperatives. Scientific socialism opposes any kind of artificial speed-up of collectivisation. Engels stressed that when the proletariat takes state power into its hands, it must give the peasant enough time to think on his clump of land, so that he can decide for himself whether or not to go over to socialist cooperative farming. He was strongly against coercive measures with respect to the peasant, for such measures, he felt, would only alienate him from the working class. "When we are in possession of state power," he wrote, "we shall not even think of forcibly expropriating the small peasants (regardless of whether with or without compensation), as we shall have to do in the

¹ T. U. Usubaliyev, "The Republics of the Soviet East—the Living Embodiment of Lenin's Theory of the Transition of Formerly Backward Peoples to Socialism, By-Passing the Capitalist Stage of Development", *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 24, 1971.

case of the big landowners. Our task relative to the small peasant consists, in the first place, in effecting a transition of his private enterprise and private possession to cooperative ones, not forcibly but by dint of example and the proffer of social assistance for this purpose."¹

In the conditions of the socialist revolution, Lenin worked out the methods, forms and basic principles of peasant cooperation. He pointed out that because of the nature of their production and their dual nature, the peasants could not be expected to switch immediately to the path of socialist transformation, for cooperation touched deep economic and social foundations of millions of peasant farms and broke with age-old traditions and habits. He wrote, "The proletarian state must effect the transition to collective farming with extreme caution and only very gradually, by the force of example, without any coercion of the middle peasant."²

Pursuing a basic policy aimed at the socialist reorganisation of agriculture, the Leninist Party and the socialist state at definite stages allowed certain growth of individual peasant farms, but at the same time strove to persuade the peasants of the economic advantages of cooperatives. Various kinds of cooperatives that met both the individual interests of the peasants and the interests of society as a whole, served as intermediate steps in the transition from the individual farm to production cooperatives. The formation of such cooperatives was one of the characteristic features of non-capitalist development in Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

DEVELOPMENT OF VARIOUS FORMS OF COOPERATION

The socialist reorganisation of the countryside in the Soviet Union has shown that the creation of primary cooperatives is necessary both for advanced and backward regions. In backward regions, however, the formation and growth of primary cooperatives are combined with

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 470.

² V. I. Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses on the Agrarian Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 157.

revolutionary-democratic transformations aimed at destroying the vestiges of the pre-bourgeois system.

In the first place, primary cooperatives help in abolishing pre-bourgeois (commercial and usurious) forms of exploitation. Secondly, they prevent capitalist tendencies in small-scale production. And, thirdly, they prepare the socio-economic conditions for the transition from small-scale to large-scale socialist production.

The practice of non-capitalist development of Central Asia and Kazakhstan advanced several forms of cooperation: cooperatives in the sphere of circulation; consumer cooperatives, specialised by branches of agriculture; supply and marketing cooperatives; seed-raising associations; land-reclamation associations; etc.

The primary form of cooperation in Central Asia was the *supply and marketing cooperative*. It was the simplest and most easily understood by the peasants. Upon joining a cooperative of this kind, the peasant retained ownership of the means of production and the products of his labour; but he could sell the products of his farm through the cooperative at a price that justified his labour, and also buy through it industrial goods at state prices. This system helped in ousting private capital from commodity circulation and enhanced the influence of the state on the development of peasant farms. In 1928-29 alone, Tajik peasants sold over 9 million rubles' worth of goods to the state through these forms of cooperatives, and themselves bought 600,000 rubles' worth of goods (not counting food products) at state prices.¹ The agricultural cooperatives delivered 4.3 million rubles' worth of industrial crops, 1 million rubles' worth of cereals, 2.3 million rubles' worth of dried fruit and vegetables, 900,000 rubles' worth of cocoons and 400,000 rubles' worth of animal raw materials.²

¹ K. S. Saidmuradov, *The Development of Various Forms of Primary Cooperation in the Agriculture of Tajikistan*. Proceedings of the Seminar, "The Experience of Agrarian Transformations in the Republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and Its Significance for Newly Independent Countries", pp. 1-4 (in Russian).

² *History of the Tajik People*, Vol. 3, Book 1, Moscow, 1964, p. 197 (in Russian).

Along with supply and marketing cooperatives, *credit cooperatives* were also fairly widespread. Their primary task was to promote the development of cotton growing. The cultivation of cotton, one of the basic agricultural crops in Central Asia, was extremely labour consuming and required big money outlays. As a rule, all of the cotton-growing farms needed credit for production purposes. The peasants, who had long been victims of usury, were extremely interested in the cheap credit offered by the credit cooperative. At the same time, they were just as interested in the collective sale of their cotton in order to free themselves from exploitation by the merchants. This explains the great attraction that credit associations had for the peasant. As early as 1926-27, there were 115 agricultural credit associations in Tajikistan, embracing 28,700 *dehkan* farms, or 21 per cent of all the farms in the republic. Credit granted to agricultural associations by the end of 1927 amounted to 2.3 million rubles.¹

Credit in the hands of the Soviet state was a means of influencing the socio-economic development of the countryside. In granting credit to an association, the state made stipulations as how it was to be used, and the association took upon itself the responsibility for distributing the credit as indicated. Credit was given exclusively to working farms, which at that time produced the bulk of the marketable goods.

Initially, the cotton-growing cooperatives engaged primarily in supply and marketing operations. These operations improved as the cooperatives grew stronger. The cooperatives themselves acquired broader rights and greater independence. In the course of this process, the groundwork was being laid for the eventual unification of small-scale producers into production cooperatives. A good example of this was the development of cotton-growing cooperation in the Central Asian republics—Tajikistan, in particular. The first phase was guarantee cooperation, which consisted in guaranteeing repayment of advances made to cotton growers by the state. The actual contractual arrangements with the cotton growers,

¹ K. S. Saidmuradov, *op. cit.*

the purchase of raw materials and all the accounting operations were handled by state cotton committees. The second phase was the contracting cooperation in which the cooperative concluded contract agreements on its own and distributed advances against the future harvest among the cotton growers. The third phase was a form of cooperation in which the cooperatives regulated all the economic ties between the cotton growers and the state, from contracting to the purchase of raw materials. Finally, the fourth phase was cooperation with independent areas under crops, which worked on its own means.

An important role in the development of cotton-growing cooperation in the republics of Central Asia was played by the Resolution of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR of May 11, 1928, "On Cotton-Growing Cooperation". It provided for measures aimed at promoting the transition from cotton-growing cooperation to production cooperation. Turned over to the cotton-growing cooperatives were such functions as supplying association members with seeds, bread, agricultural implements and fertilisers, organising agricultural stations and demonstration plots, carrying out the mechanised cultivation of the fields, etc. Collective associations received cash advances raised by 25 per cent. Their distribution quotas for bread, fertilisers and sowing seeds were increased. They were given priority in receiving cash advances, fertilisers, seeds, means of pest control and implements. And provisions were made for giving bonuses to farms that used improved farming techniques and produced big harvests.¹ These measures promoted the further growth of cooperation. In 1928-29, cotton-growing cooperatives united 44,100 farms in the Tajik ASSR. In the main, these were farms representing the poorest strata of the peasantry.

In Tajikistan as in other cotton-growing regions of the country, everything was done to encourage the poor peasants to join the cooperatives. The size of the entrance fee and deposit share, and the length of time allowed to

¹ *Preparation of Conditions for Complete Collectivisation in Uzbekistan (1927-1929)*. Collection of Documents, Tashkent, 1961, pp. 246-47 (in Russian).

pay off the deposit shares varied. The farm hands paid five rubles for a share and a 25 kopek entrance fee; the poor peasants paid ten rubles and 75 kopeks, respectively; the middle peasants, 35 rubles and one ruble 75 kopeks. The farm hands and poor peasants could pay in their shares over a period of three years, with the largest part (40 per cent) falling due in the last year. The middle peasants paid in their shares in equal parts over a two-year period.¹ Moreover, special funds were set aside by the state and the cooperatives themselves for the purpose of assisting poor peasants in making their share deposits. Entrance of well-to-do cotton growers was limited by a number of conditions.

Of great significance in the development of the cooperatives was the system of contracts for the purchase of agricultural products, whereby the state was able to introduce the principles of planning into the development of agriculture and indirectly determine the volume of production.

Contracting met the interests of both the state and the producers, made it possible to regulate the production of cotton on private farms, and precluded spontaneous price fluctuations. The contracting organisation established beforehand a fixed price for a given product and issued advances against future payment for the harvest. Advances to poor and middle farms were paid in cash, seeds and equipment. In 1928, over 1.5 million rubles in cash and 100,000 rubles' worth of seeds were given to Tajik cotton growers in the form of advances.

In concluding the agreement, the representative of the state, as a party to the contract, would stipulate that certain work be done to increase the area under cultivation and enlarge the yield, that certain improvements be made in the irrigation system and the care given the harvest, etc. To carry out such measures, several peasant families often had to pool their labour, and this helped them to realise the need for collective farming. In addition, this approach brought an increasingly greater volume of agricultural production under

¹ K. S. Saidmuradov, *op. cit.*

contract. By 1928-29, 57.6 per cent of all the agricultural commercial produce in Tajikistan was under contract, representing a total of 39,168,000 rubles. This included nearly 100 per cent of the cotton production.¹

In solving the problem of water management and improving water use relationships, a big role was played by land improvement associations, which received substantial material support from the state. The way in which such cooperatives became organised corresponded to local conditions. Central Asia already had a history of peasant cooperation in the area of irrigation work. Peasants from one or several villages often used a single irrigation system to irrigate their fields and as a rule worked on the system jointly within the framework of a commune of water users. Such traditions facilitated the development of land improvement cooperatives, whose basic function consisted in organising the peasants for carrying out local irrigation work. They were essentially irrigation cooperatives.

To back the land improvement cooperatives financially, a special fund was established with money derived primarily from the republican budget and state economic organisations. The land improvement cooperatives received low-interest loans and sometimes even gratuitous aid from the fund. In 1929, 51,600 rubles were released by the republican government of Tajikistan for the needs of the land improvement associations.

Local land improvement associations not only united the efforts of water users for carrying out small irrigation projects, but also pursued a class policy of protecting and satisfying the needs of the working peasantry. They took an active part in introducing class standards of irrigation work. For instance, farms with up to 1.5 hectares of irrigated land fulfilled 50 per cent of the average irrigation work quota, while farms with more than five hectares fulfilled 200 per cent of the average quota.

In the land improvement associations, just as in the cotton-growing associations, the class approach was also used with respect to the size of the share deposit and the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

granting of credits. The share deposit required of poor peasants was one-twelfth that of the well-to-do farmers. Poor farmers received credit calculated on the basis of 100 per cent of the overall cost of the social irrigation work they did, while farms exploiting hired labour received no credit at all, and had to operate wholly on their own means.¹

Soviet scholar K. S. Saidmuradov, who has made a thorough study of the various forms of primary cooperation in the agriculture of Central Asia and Tajikistan, in particular, points out that elements of production cooperation were more strongly developed in the land improvement cooperatives than in the cotton-growing cooperatives. In the latter, supply and marketing functions predominated initially, with elements of production cooperation taking shape only later, whereas in land improvement cooperation, these elements were there from the very beginning. Cotton-growing cooperation influenced the peasant farm by socialising the sphere of circulation and introducing planning principles into commodity-money relations. The main function of land improvement cooperation, however, was to unite the efforts of the peasants in the actual work of supplying their farms with water, which for irrigation farming is of fundamental importance to production. Cooperative member farms worked on irrigation projects jointly and adhered to a class approach with respect to water use. Land improvement cooperation meant a partial socialisation of labour, for its functions embraced not production as a whole, but only one of its aspects, namely, the reconstruction and maintenance of irrigation systems. But the work of the land improvement cooperatives also had a direct effect on production in that it resulted in the restoration and growth of land under irrigation. With state assistance, the cooperatives guided the initiative of the peasants towards small-scale irrigation construction, and this led to a definite initial growth in the area of irrigated land. In the period between 1925 and 1929,

¹ K. S. Saidmuradov, op. cit., p. 6.

the total area of land under irrigation in Tajikistan grew from 105,100 hectares to 226,400 hectares.¹

In this section, we examined only three forms of primary cooperation—the supply and marketing, the credit and the land improvement cooperatives. The experience in forming and developing other forms of cooperatives—consumer cooperatives, producer cooperatives, etc.—deserves careful study by progressive forces of newly independent states. This experience shows that in Central Asia the primary cooperatives became the mainstay of the working peasantry. They gave the peasants cash loans and thereby freed them from the need to resort to the services of money lenders. And through the cooperatives, the peasants were able to take the necessary measures to improve their crop yield.

But whatever forms of primary cooperation there may be, they do not ensure socialist transformations in agriculture, inasmuch as under these forms individual peasant farms remain. They are only preparatory steps towards the transition from pre-capitalist to socialist production relations. This was brought out by Lenin, who wrote: "If 'we' are successfully to solve the problem of our immediate transition to socialism, we must understand what *intermediary* paths, methods, means and instruments are required for the transition from *pre-capitalist* relations to socialism."²

As we emphasised in the first chapter, ignoring the intermediary stages can injure the very cause of effecting socialist transformations. This was borne out, for example, by what happened in the Mongolian People's Republic. There, the distribution among the poor *arats* of livestock that had been confiscated from the feudal lords facilitated the development of a cooperative movement. The *arats* saw the necessity of entering into the simplest forms of cooperation, such as joint pasturage, joint hauling, collective fodder storage, etc. The "Leftists" looked

¹ K. S. Saidmuradov, *Building the Foundations of the Socialist Economy in the Agriculture of Tajikistan*, Dushanbe, 1965, p. 84 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin, "The Tax in Kind", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 349.

upon these efforts as an indication of their readiness to unite into agricultural production cooperatives. In fact, however, the conditions for this had not yet matured. The "Leftist" elements in the leadership of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party nonetheless began introducing higher forms of collective farming by administrative order.

The attempt to jump over the intermediary stage of the revolution inflicted damage to Mongolia's agriculture, one of the results being a substantial decrease in the country's stock of cattle. It evoked discontent among the broad masses of *arats* and shook their confidence in the advantages of collective farming.

These "Leftist" errors were exposed and condemned at the Extraordinary Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party in June 1932.¹ The Party adopted a policy of encouraging simple forms of voluntary *arat* cooperation in carrying out the more labour-consuming work in livestock raising, and continued to seek forms of cooperation that were appropriate for Mongolia. The Ninth Congress of the MPRP (1934) oriented the Party towards giving the *arats* all-round support in their efforts to increase the livestock population. The Party did not try to speed up the collectivisation of the *arat* farms. It took a cautious approach to the organisation of cooperation, making sure that it developed along strictly voluntary lines without any kind of pressure from above, so that the *arats* could come to realise the advantages of cooperative farming from their own experience. This policy ensured the gradual but steady growth of *arat* production associations. They grew stronger both organisationally and economically, until finally, by the end of the 1950s, the socialist transformation of agriculture in Mongolia was completed.

The development of various forms of primary cooperatives is of great importance for the successful progress of backward countries along the non-capitalist road. They

¹ B. Balzhinyan, "Cooperative Agriculture in the Mongolian People's Republic", *World Marxist Review* No. 7, 1966, p. 8.

bring the small producers right up to the socialisation of the means of production and labour on a mass scale. As Lenin pointed out, "To transform a vast number of small peasant farms into large farms is something that cannot be done immediately. Agriculture, which has hitherto been conducted on a haphazard basis, cannot immediately or in a short space of time be socialised and transformed into large-scale state enterprise...."¹

The various forms of cooperation shorten the road to this goal.

THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION—AN INTEGRAL PART OF NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT

The successes scored in the non-capitalist development of the Soviet republics of Central Asia were directly connected with the accomplishment of a cultural revolution. Without a successful cultural revolution it would have been impossible to build socialism. Socialism is above all high labour productivity on the basis of the latest advances in science and technology, which in turn requires of the people a high level of culture and knowledge. Socialism is the fruit of the conscious creative activity of the masses, which is impossible without profound transformations in the cultural life of society, without the masses gaining access to all the cultural wealth accumulated by mankind. Lenin wrote in 1917: "In the old days, human genius, the brain of man, created only to give some the benefits of technology and culture, and to deprive others of the bare necessities, education and development. From now on all the marvels of science and the gains of culture belong to the nation as a whole, and never again will man's brain and human genius be used for oppression and exploitation."²

Before looking into the question of how the cultural revolution proceeded in the Soviet republics of Central Asia, we should first say a word about its basic goals. These were determined, firstly, by the desire to abolish

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Speech at a Meeting of Poor Peasants' Committees", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 171-72.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 481-82.

illiteracy and develop public education as the major conditions for bringing culture and politics within the reach of all working people; secondly, by the need to create a new socialist culture which would absorb all the cultural values developed by mankind; and thirdly, by the need to create a new working intelligentsia—a Soviet intelligentsia.

The cultural revolution in the republics of Central Asia proceeded under extremely difficult and complicated conditions. A considerable part of the population led a nomadic way of life. The tsarist government had allocated ridiculously meagre funds to education. In Turkestan, for example, it spent an average of only 22 kopeks per person per year on education.¹ Literate people were a rarity, making up only 1.5 per cent of the population. Only 3 per cent of the children received any kind of schooling.² Many of the peoples of Central Asia practiced seclusion of women, who were isolated from society, enslaved and disfranchised.

It was necessary to awaken the consciousness of millions of downtrodden people, to open the doors to the temple of science, literature and art to them, to create national cadres capable of managing the state and the economy on the basis of advanced science and technology. The Soviet Government's first document on public education, the Address to the Population by the People's Commissar of Education of October 29 (November 12), 1917, declared that the Communist Party and the Soviet Government made their first aim the struggle against illiteracy, ignorance and darkness.

Lenin regarded the abolishment of illiteracy as a major requisite for the building of socialism. On December 26, 1919, he signed a decree On the Abolishment of Illiteracy Among the Population of the RSFSR, which launched a broad popular campaign aimed at universal literacy. "In order to afford the entire population

¹ R. A. Tuzmukhamedov, *A Reply to Slanderers. Self-Determination of the Peoples of Central Asia and International Law*, Moscow, 1969, p. 121 (in Russian).

² S. Sherkhmukhamedov, *On the National Form of the Uzbek People's Socialist Culture*, Tashkent, 1961, p. 15 (in Russian).

of the republic an opportunity to participate consciously in the country's political life," the decree said, "the Council of People's Commissars has decided that all citizens of the republic between 8 and 50 years of age who do not know how to read and write shall be obliged to learn reading and writing either in their native language or, if they choose, in Russian."

On the basis of this historic document, the Soviet Government of the Turkestan Republic issued on September 17, 1920, a decree On the Elimination of Illiteracy Among the Population of the Turkestan Republic, outlining broad measures to be taken to overcome the age-old backwardness of the peoples of Turkestan. Every illiterate person between the ages of 8 and 50 was obliged to learn to read and write. Trade unions, local cells of the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, the Union of Poor Peasants, committees for work among women, etc., were called upon to take an active part in the anti-illiteracy drive. The working day for any adult attending reading and writing classes was to be reduced by two hours with no reduction in pay. Space in churches, mosques, prayer houses, clubs and some private houses and all suitable premises in factories and Soviet establishments were to be made available for holding classes in reading and writing. Persons refusing to carry out the provisions of the Decree or hindering anyone from attending a school or class would be called to account.

The publication of the Decree marked the beginning of a vigorous campaign to abolish illiteracy among the adult population of the Turkestan Republic. The difficulties involved were enormous, for there were no trained teachers among the local population, no textbooks and teaching materials in the native language, and not enough paper and other school supplies. But nothing could stop the movement once it started. The problem of the acute shortage of professional teachers was resolved at first by involving everyone who could read and write in the task of teaching others. The slogan was: "Every literate to teach ten illiterate."

On December 11, 1920, an Extraordinary Commission for Combating Illiteracy was established in Turkestan.

The Instrument on Extraordinary Commissions for Combating Illiteracy adopted earlier by the Council of People's Commissars stated that the purpose of such commissions was to effect the rapid and systematic education of the illiterate population. To this end, the commissions were charged with the job of organising teacher training, publishing teaching materials, opening RRR schools, registering all literate and illiterate people, and deciding all other questions that would facilitate the most rapid elimination of illiteracy.

The anti-illiteracy campaign met with stiff resistance on the part of reactionary elements, who raised a hue and cry about the "violation of national customs" and did everything possible to stir up opposition. They put up an especially bitter fight against measures aimed at the emancipation of women in a frantic effort to preserve the old patriarchal-feudal relations and frustrate the aspirations of women for enlightenment, knowledge and culture.

An important role in the struggle for women's emancipation was played by the special women's departments that had been set up within the Party's Central Committee and committees of local Party organisations shortly after the revolution. At first, the personnel of these departments consisted of Russian women who lived and worked in Central Asia and knew the local language, and women activists sent by the Party from the central regions of the country. One of their activities was to organise women's conferences in the districts and cities and women's congresses on a republican scale, all dealing with the role of women in the social life of the country, their rights, their equal status, etc.

One of the ways in which women began to take an active part in public affairs was through the so-called delegate meetings that functioned in conjunction with the women's departments of the Party committees and consisted of women workers, peasants, and office workers who were elected at women's meetings for terms of six months to a year. Besides attending lectures and taking part in discussions on political, cultural and educational topics, the women delegates were drawn into the work of

Soviet committees, hospitals, schools, children's institutions, clubs, courts and cooperatives. They reported on the work they did to the women who elected them.

The struggle for the emancipation of women and the abolition of illiteracy was a vitally important part of the cultural revolution. But a real cultural revolution could not be effected only on the basis of schools for combating illiteracy. What was required was to organise a system of universal compulsory primary education and then gradually develop a broad network of specialised secondary schools and higher educational institutions.

This grandiose task was accomplished with the help of the peoples of the Russian Federation and other republics. The local Kazakh, Tajik, Uzbek and Kirghiz personnel required to staff the burgeoning national schools received their training in the higher educational institutions of Soviet Russia. The rate of training specialists with a higher education was and still is higher in the Central Asian republics than the all-Union average. In 1966/67, there were 225 times as many Uzbek students attending institutions of higher learning and 19 times as many attending specialised secondary schools as in 1927/28. The difference factor for Kirghiz students was 187 and 28 respectively; Tajik, 199 and 45; and Turkmen, 178 and 20.¹

In addition to training the national cadres of the Central Asian republics, the higher educational institutions of the Russian Federation and other fraternal republics also sent hundreds of their own specialists—engineers, doctors, teachers, etc.—to Central Asia. Also, the first textbooks for Central Asian schools were published in Moscow, Leningrad and Kazan. The Minister of Public Education of Soviet Kirghizstan, Professor A. K. Kanimetov, writes that "the first school buildings were designed by Moscow and Leningrad architects. All the school equipment, from school desks to teaching aids, was produced in Russia and delivered to us."²

¹ *The Land of the Soviets for 50 Years*, Moscow, 1967, p. 280 (in Russian).

² A. K. Kanimetov, *From Illiteracy to the Flourishing of Public Education*. Materials of the Seminar, "The Experience of Agra-

In 1936, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government adopted a resolution "On the Work of Teaching the Illiterate and Semi-literate", which set the task of totally abolishing illiteracy among the adult population in 1936 and 1937. In 1937, the Kirghiz Republic allocated 7,944,000 rubles for education, which was more than twice the amount for the whole period between 1925 and 1936. Courses designed to train teachers for adult schools were inaugurated. Illiterate people in the agricultural regions were given instruction right at their place of work, and mobile schools were sent into the cattle-raising areas. Individual-group teaching was conducted everywhere—in the home, in schools, in clubs, etc. Instruction was in the native language. Between 1925 and 1939, adult schools in Kirghizia taught about 800,000 people, and by 1939 the republic's literacy rate had risen to 70 per cent, as compared with 11.5 per cent in 1926.¹ According to official figures, the literacy rates as of January 17, 1939, were as follows: Uzbek SSR, 73.6 per cent among men, 61.6 per cent among women, and 67.8 per cent overall; Turkmen SSR, 73.3, 60.6 and 67.2 per cent, respectively; Kirghiz SSR, 76.7, 63 and 70 per cent; Tajik SSR, 77.7, 65.2 and 71.7 per cent.² This was accomplished in a relatively short period of time—less than two decades. By the time of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union in 1940, the number of people enrolled in some kind of educational establishment had grown in comparison with 1914, in Kazakhstan 10.5-fold; in Turkmenia 34-fold; in Kirghizia 47-fold; in Uzbekistan 71-fold; and in Tajikistan 75.7-fold.³ The role of women in social and political life and in social production grew markedly. In Uzbekistan, for example, the number of women working at industrial enterprises grew from 15.1 per cent in 1928 to 40.7 per cent in 1940.

rian Transformations in the Republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and Its Significance for Newly Independent Countries", p. 7.

¹ A. K. Kanimetov, op. cit., p. 6.

² *Cultural Construction of the USSR*. Statistical Handbook, Moscow-Leningrad, 1940 (in Russian).

³ *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 24, 1971.

The cultural revolution in the republics of Central Asia—an integral part of their non-capitalist way of development—revealed the tremendous creative potential of the people and gave them full access to culture. The main and most important result of the cultural revolution was the formation of the new man, educated and socially and politically conscious, brought up on the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism. This speeded the progress of the Central Asian republics and helped them create the material and technical basis of socialism.

Marx and Engels showed that it is not ideas that ultimately determine the development of social life, but that social consciousness itself depends on the economic structure of society. The material life of society is primary and determining, and its spiritual life is secondary and derivative. Marx wrote: "The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness."¹ This is the basic proposition of historical materialism. But this does not imply, as some bourgeois scholars say, that Marxism-Leninism denies the active role of ideas, that it does not recognise the spiritual and ideational factor in social life.

On the contrary, Marxism-Leninism constantly stresses that ideas should not be regarded as something of secondary importance. Ideas play a great and active role in the historical process. Ideology has a relative independence, as expressed in the fact that ideas can either precede the development of society or lag behind it. Engels wrote: "According to the materialist conception of history, the *ultimately* determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. Hence, if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the *only* determining one, he transforms that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase."²

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 4, p. 503.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 487.

In the course of the cultural revolution in Central Asia, the consciousness of the popular masses was freed from the burden of obsolete views, superstitions, and everything that hampered progressive development. The establishment of the socialist ideology in the consciousness of the masses awakened them to active political and social life, to the building of a just socialist society. The ideas of scientific socialism became a powerful force helping them to make a gigantic leap from backwardness to progress, from pre-capitalist, feudal relations, through the non-capitalist stage, to socialism.

THE SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION OF AGRICULTURE AND SOCIALIST INDUSTRIALISATION

The agrarian reforms carried out in the 1920s in Central Asia and Kazakhstan paved the way for the socialist reconstruction of agriculture on the basis of Lenin's cooperative plan. Lenin saw that the only way to raise labour productivity in agriculture and thus ensure a rapid growth in the well-being of the peasantry was through unification of small farms and their transition to large-scale production, using machinery and the achievements of science. He pointed out that cooperation under the conditions of the Soviet state was different in substance and meaning from cooperation under capitalism. "Under our present system," he wrote, "cooperative enterprises differ from private capitalist enterprises because they are collective enterprises, but do not differ from socialist enterprises if the land on which they are situated and the means of production belong to the state, i.e., the working class."¹ He stressed that the organisation of peasants into cooperatives would strengthen the alliance of workers and peasants—the basis and the highest principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat—and that this cause required the constant and all-round support of the Communist Party and the proletarian state—material, financial, political and organisational. The substance of

¹ V. I. Lenin, "On Cooperation", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 473.

Lenin's cooperative plan, enriched by the experience of the socialist restructuring of agriculture in the Soviet republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, in Mongolia and other countries of socialism, is exhaustively presented in the book, *Fundamentals of Scientific Communism*, published by the Academy of Social Sciences of the CC CPSU. "The policy of Marxist-Leninist parties on organising peasant farms into cooperatives," the book says, "includes the following principles:

"—voluntary transition to cooperative farming, which rules out the introduction of cooperatives against the will of the peasant masses;

"—the gradual nature of this process, excluding artificial acceleration of the rate of collectivisation;

"—consistency in the transition from lower and simpler forms of cooperation to higher and more complex forms, which excludes jumping immediately to the higher forms, by-passing the lower;

"—taking into account, when choosing the form of cooperation, the concrete conditions of the given country, the peculiarities of the economic region, the national features and traditions, and the methods of farming;

"—consistent application of the principle of material incentive in the cooperatives;

"—combining the collective farming of the cooperatives with the personal farming of the peasants who join the cooperatives, excluding forcible elimination of private auxiliary farms or their excessive limitation, which would be detrimental to the individual interests of the members of the cooperatives and the interests of the social economy;

"—development of democratic self-management in the cooperatives in the interests of the cooperatives and the public interests;

"—all-round assistance to the cooperative movement on the part of the proletarian state and the working class in the form of supplying the means of production, machinery, chemicals, credits, specialists, organisers, etc."¹

¹ *Fundamentals of Scientific Communism*, p. 276 (in Russian).

The implementation of Lenin's cooperative plan in Central Asia and Kazakhstan had its specific features in comparison, for example, with the central and western regions of the Soviet Union. The chief difference had to do with the fact that, along with the elimination of capitalist and kulak elements, the problem of rooting out the vestiges of pre-capitalist, patriarchal-tribal relations had to be solved. It was also necessary to take into account the unique socio-economic conditions of the various regions—nomadic, settled agricultural, and resettled—each of which required a specific approach and a great deal of time to carry out the collectivisation plan. Furthermore, the fierce resistance of the class enemies of Soviet power had to be overcome.

However, despite all these difficulties and complexities the working people of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, under the leadership of the Communist Party, carried out the plan, at the same time helping the nomadic and semi-nomadic population to go over to a settled way of life.

Broad assistance was rendered in this respect by front-rank Russian workers who arrived in Central Asia in response to the call of the Party and became active vehicles of its policy and organisers of collective labour there. In the second half of the 1930s the socialist sector in the agriculture of the Soviet Eastern republics was victorious everywhere. The result was a single socialist system of agriculture throughout the Soviet Union.

Implementation of Lenin's cooperative plan freed the peasants from bondage to the kulaks and put an end to their class stratification and ruination.

Lenin considered heavy industry to be the key to the socialist reconstruction of agriculture, the basic condition for rooting out capitalism in the countryside. He wrote, "We say: large-scale industry is the only means of saving the peasantry from want and starvation."¹ He stressed that the material and technical basis of socialism was large-scale mechanised production in the city and the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Third Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 493.

countryside, and that this basis could be created only through socialist industrialisation.

Socialist industrialisation excludes the use of the methods of capitalist industrialisation, which involve deriving the funds for industrialisation from such sources as the plunder of colonial and dependent countries, extraction of military tribute from defeated nations, and merciless exploitation of the working people. The sources of funds for investment in socialist industrialisation are increased labour productivity by means of introducing new technology, use of advanced production techniques, use of the advantages of planned economic management, rational distribution of labour, material and financial resources, and reduced production and distribution costs. The policy of socialist industrialisation gives priority to investment in heavy industry, using a system of financing, credits and foreign trade for the import of the necessary means of production—machines and equipment—and for the training of a large body of skilled workers, technicians and engineers.

The forms and rates of industrialisation vary. For example, the experience of Mongolia and Cuba shows that in some countries it is possible and advisable to begin by building up industries that serve agriculture and the processing of agricultural products. The industrialisation of Central Asia and Kazakhstan was carried out in accordance with the various local conditions.

The Central Asian republics had been the agrarian, raw material producing appendages of the more developed regions of tsarist Russia. Pre-revolutionary Turkestan, for example, had only 702 enterprises, all with primitive equipment and engaged mainly in processing agricultural raw materials, primarily cotton. Workers in Turkestan made up only 0.35 per cent of the total population.¹

The socialist industrialisation of the Central Asian republics began simultaneously with the industrialisation of the other republics of the Soviet Union. The policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government was

¹ M. S. Dzhususov, *On the Historical Experience of Building Socialism in Formerly Backward Countries*, Moscow, 1958, p. 98 (in Russian).

directed at building up the economy of all the republics and enhancing the role of each nation in the economic, political and cultural life of the country as a whole. However, the Party devoted special attention to the more backward republics and regions. Larger allocations from the USSR state budget were directed to such regions. In the first five-year plan period alone, over 2,500 million rubles were released for the development of the economy and culture of the republics of Central Asia, and the rate of industrial development there was considerably higher than that for the Soviet Union as a whole. During that period, the gross industrial output in the USSR grew by 2.3 times, but in Central Asia, by 3.7 times.¹

In the course of the first two five-year plans, large-scale industrial production was built up essentially from scratch. In 1937, about 90 per cent of the industrial production in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan and 97 per cent of such production in Kirghizia, Turkmenia and Tajikistan came from enterprises built or fully reconstructed during the industrialisation period. Many branches of heavy industry—mechanical engineering, machine-tool making, metallurgy, etc.—were set up for the first time in the Soviet East. With the fraternal cooperation of the other Soviet republics, the problem of training national cadres was solved. Hundreds of engineers and technicians came to Central Asia from the Russian Federation. Also organised was the accelerated training of Kazakh, Tajik, Uzbek and Kirghiz cadres in the educational institutions of Moscow, Leningrad, Omsk, Tashkent, Kazan, and other cities.

The industrialisation of the Soviet Central Asian republics facilitated the development of their productive forces, laid the economic basis for the rapid development of their entire economies and especially of their agriculture. It also led to a qualitative change in the social and class structure of the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and the emergence of a national working class there. That industrialisation, carried out in a relatively short period of time in backward regions

¹ *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 24, 1971.

where pre-capitalist relations had prevailed—industrialisation that was not capitalist, but socialist in character—is of lasting international significance. This becomes especially apparent when we consider the concrete achievements to which the non-capitalist way of development led the Soviet East.

LIVING EMBODIMENT OF SOCIALISM

Total abolition of feudalism and all remnants of colonialism, emancipation of the peasants, elimination in the countryside of all forms of exploitation of man by man, socialist industrialisation and the organisation of peasant farms into cooperatives, and the cultural revolution—all this put the peoples of the Soviet republics of Central Asia firmly on the road of economic and social progress. Revolutionary-democratic reforms followed by socialist transformations changed the face of Central Asia and Kazakhstan beyond recognition. The once backward colonial outskirts of the tsarist empire were transformed into highly developed, flourishing socialist republics.

The capitalist West needed 150 years for industrialisation; the Soviet republics of Central Asia needed 30. English professor Alec Nove, despite his unconcealed hostility to the Soviet Union, has had to concede that the economic growth rates of the Soviet Central Asian republics are "impressive". He has also admitted: "In a free-enterprise setting ... it is very doubtful if there would be rapid industrial growth in these regions."¹ Geoffrey Wheeler, Director of the Central Asian Research Centre in London, notes: "After the war, the economy and the material condition of the people in the Central Asian Republics made further progress."² The following figures on industrial and agricultural production growth illustrate the successes scored by the peoples of the Central Asian republics of Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenia.

¹ Alec Nove and J. A. Newth, *The Soviet Middle East. A Communist Model for Development*, p. 45.

² *New Society* No. 171, January 6, 1966, p. 12.

Growth of Industrial and Agricultural Production
in the Republics of Central Asia by 1968
(base year—1913)¹

Republic	Industry	Agriculture
Kirghizia	152 times	5.5 times
Tajikistan	76 "	6.3 "
Turkmenia	39 "	4.2 "
Uzbekistan	37 "	4.7 "

Such rapid rates of economic growth are accounted for by the superiority of the socialist economic system, where public ownership of the means of production is established, where there are no exploiters and exploited, where haphazard social development gives way to the planned organisation of production and social life. Public ownership economically unites all working people as equal owners of and participants in production who work for themselves and for society as a whole.

Uniting the national economy into a single whole, public ownership of the means of production takes two forms: (a) a system of state enterprises which are the property of the people as a whole and have only a certain degree of economic independence, and (b) cooperative farms which are the property of separate groups or collectives of people. The economic connection between these forms is realised through commodity exchange. While excluding land, enterprises, and labour power from this exchange, socialism retains and uses commodity-money relations as one of the main economic levers of its development. Commodity-money relations under socialism are free of any element of exploitation; they express new relations between producers who are free from exploitation and are joint owners of the publicly owned means of production.

¹ See *The USSR and Foreign Countries After the Victory of the October Socialist Revolution*. Statistical Handbook, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian).

What, concretely, are the advantages of the socialist economic system over the capitalist system?

Under socialism, economic crises and anarchy of production are excluded; production is planned and ensures a steady growth of the productive forces in the interests of the working people. The advantages of socialist economic management, then, stem from the social character of production in industry and agriculture, economic planning and social development on a nation-wide scale, the elimination of foreign exploitation and the creation of all the conditions necessary for the full expression of the creative talent of the masses. In the eighth five-year plan period alone (1966-70), about 800 large industrial enterprises and shops were put into operation in Kazakhstan and the republics of Central Asia. Kirghizia alone produced almost three times as much in 1970 as was produced in all of Russia in 1913.¹

Socialism does away with the kind of parasitic consumption that eats up no small part of the national income in capitalist countries. In a socialist society, the national income is distributed in the interests of the working people, in the interests of extended socialist reproduction, which makes it possible to combine higher rates of accumulation than under capitalism with a steady growth in the well-being of the working people. The collective form of farming makes it possible not only to augment and improve the material basis of agriculture itself, but also to steadily raise the living standard of the peasants. For example, between 1966 and 1970, the income of collective farmers in the Central Asian republics showed an increase of 43 to 47 per cent. In 1970, the real per worker incomes of collective farmers of Kirghizia were approximately four and a half times greater than in 1940.² Agricultural workers and all working people of the republics of the Soviet East are now well-off and secure. Nearly all collective farm families have television sets, washing machines and radios.

Because socialism frees labour from exploitation and turns it into labour for oneself, for the whole society, it

¹ *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 24, 1971.

² *Ibid.*

constantly gives rise to new stimuli to the development of production and raises every worker's productivity and efficiency. It transforms the worker from an appendage of the machine to its master, and creates favourable opportunities for applying science and technology in production. Only socialism, as Lenin wrote, opens up to the working people a real opportunity "to work for oneself and moreover to employ all the achievements of modern technology and culture in one's work".¹

Having personally acquainted himself with the situation in agriculture in Soviet Kirghizia, Abdel Khalem Idrisi, the Syrian representative at the international seminar in Frunze (August 1971) and director of an agricultural technical school, stated: "I was greatly impressed by the abundance of the most varied technology and the high level of mechanisation." Another seminar participant, Gogula Parthasarathi, a university professor from the State of Andhra Pradesh, India, said: "Not only well-to-do people have use of the blessings of mechanisation, but the entire peasantry.... Kirghizia and other regions of the Soviet Union that were once extremely backward are now flourishing republics with a highly developed industry and agriculture."² Working in the fields of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan alone are 148,000 tractors, over 40,000 cotton harvesters and over a half million other agricultural machines. This is more than twice as many as in Iraq, Yemen and Jordan put together. In 1971, every collective farm in Kirghizia had an average of over 100 tractors, combines, lorries and other agricultural machines. This has made it possible to accomplish the all-round mechanisation of peasant labour and thus assure the peasants high incomes from farming and livestock raising.

Socialism abolishes unemployment, a constant concomitant of capitalism. Under socialism it is the labour of each person that determines his social position and is the basic criterion in the distribution of material wealth.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "How to Organise Competition?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 407.

² *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 27, 1971.

The principle in operation is "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work", which means that everyone is paid according to the quantity and quality of work done. This stimulates everyone to take a personal interest in the results of his labour and the rapid development of production. Under the socialist system, the inexhaustible creative forces and abilities of formerly backward peoples in Central Asia and Kazakhstan have been unfettered. In 1971, about 900 Kazakhs and Uzbeks held the Doctor of Science degree, and 13,000 had the Candidate of Science degree. Before the revolution, there was not a single institution of higher education in the Soviet East; in 1971, the Central Asian republics had 103 higher education institutions with an enrolment of 554,000 students.¹ Uzbekistan and other republics of Central Asia have surpassed such developed capitalist countries as Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany in the rate and scope of training specialists. A United Nations report entitled "Planning for Balanced Social and Economic Development in the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic" notes: "The level of achievement in education and health in the years since Uzbekistan was established in 1924 ... is striking, particularly when comparisons are made with neighbouring Asian countries with somewhat similar basic resources and problems."²

The flourishing of each people so that all peoples may draw closer together and the drawing together of all peoples to enhance the progress of each of them, mutual aid and fraternal friendship—such are the revolutionary dialectics of the development of nations under socialism. Many Union republics have a higher production growth rate than the average for the Soviet Union as a whole. This is a regular feature of socialism. In this way, the even development of the Soviet republics is ensured. In the course of socialist construction, the economic production ties between the republics became ever stronger and more extensive.

¹ *Soviet Kirghizia*, August 24, 1971.

² United Nations, E/CN. 5/346/Add.5/Rev.1 November 10, 1961, pp. 6-7.

The experience of the Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia in non-capitalist development is of permanent value and significance for the newly independent countries. The study of this experience can help them in solving many of the problems they face. Therefore, our examination in the following chapters of the content and forms of transformation being carried out in newly independent countries today will, in a number of cases, relate directly to the experience of the peoples of Central Asia and Mongolia in the construction of a socialist society.

THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF STATES WITH A SOCIALIST ORIENTATION — THE NEW PHASE OF THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST REVOLUTION

The advantages and successes of socialism as a socio-economic system have a revolutionising influence on the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The formation in the late 1940s of the world socialist system and its subsequent consolidation and development have augmented the effect of this revolutionising factor. World socialism cannot exist and develop without accelerating the progress of other countries and peoples. Engels pointed out that socialism possesses the invincible power of example. The truth of this proposition, frequently stressed and developed by Lenin, has been amply confirmed by history.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was a mighty source of inspiration for the colonial and semi-colonial masses in their liberation struggle and drew them into the common stream of the world revolutionary movement. The colonial system of imperialism found itself in the grips of a deep-going crisis. The victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, its experience in freeing over 100 nations and nationalities from social and national oppression, the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War against German fascism and Japanese militarism, and the triumph of socialist revolutions in Eastern Europe and Asia became a powerful stimulus for a new upsurge in the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Third World. Assuming unprecedented proportions,

the movement ultimately led to the break-up of the colonial system and the formation of politically independent states.

World socialism influences the national liberation movement not only by virtue of its powerful example. As world socialism became the decisive factor in the development of mankind, the balance of forces in the world began to change radically, creating favourable conditions for the development of the newly independent countries. In the economic competition between the two world systems, socialism has scored outstanding successes both in the sphere of production, science and technology and in the sphere of ensuring the material and spiritual needs of the masses. World socialism is developing along an ascending line. In 1917, socialism accounted for only 3 per cent of the world's industrial production; in 1937, 10 per cent; and in 1970, 39 per cent.¹ Between 1951 and 1973 the gross industrial product in the capitalist countries increased only 240 per cent, while the socialist countries showed an increase of 740 per cent during the same period.²

The growing might of the socialist system has a vitally important meaning for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. By weakening the positions of world imperialism, it opens up before them new possibilities for successfully countering the attacks of imperialism and striking at their positions. The world socialist system paralyses the aggressive forces of imperialism, hampering their efforts to export counter-revolutions and suppress the national liberation movement. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries came out in defence of the Cuban Revolution, and their active and consistent support was a vitally important factor in the struggle of the peoples of Vietnam and other countries of Indochina against imperialist interventionists. It also helped to stop the aggression and restore peace in this area. The socialist states' vigorous support of the just struggle of the Arab peoples was instrumental in frustrating imperialist plans to overthrow the progressive regimes in Arab countries

¹ *World Marxist Review* No. 1, 1971, p. 27.

² *International Affairs* No. 5, Moscow, 1974, p. 119.

in 1967. Thanks to the Soviet Union's consistent policy of defending the rights of peoples, the Israeli aggressors failed to achieve their expansionist aims in October 1973.

THE CHARACTER OF NATIONAL LIBERATION REVOLUTIONS TODAY

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America were never reconciled to colonial and imperialist oppression. Theirs is the history of selfless struggle against the colonisers. However, even when some peoples succeeded in escaping the yoke of one coloniser, they generally ended up in the grips of another, more powerful, colonial power. This is what happened to many Latin American states. After shaking off the oppression of Spanish and Portuguese colonisers and winning independence, they found themselves in bondage first to England and then to the United States. When capitalism held undivided sway in the world, the colonial peoples had no real opportunity for genuine political and social liberation.

When capitalism entered its last, imperialist, stage and the era of proletarian revolutions began, the national liberation movement became the objective and loyal ally of these revolutions, and an integral part of the world revolutionary process. Referring to the upsurge of the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East, Lenin stressed that they "are being drawn into—have already been drawn into—the revolutionary struggle, the revolutionary movement, the world revolution",¹ into "the general maelstrom of the world revolutionary movement".² "World imperialism," he wrote, "shall fall when the revolutionary onslaught of the exploited and oppressed workers in each country ... merges with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of people who have hitherto stood beyond the pale of history, and have been regarded merely as the object of history."³

¹ V. I. Lenin, "On the Tenth Anniversary of *Pravda*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 350.

² V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, But Better", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 499.

³ V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 232.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution created the political and material prerequisites for this merger, and the emergence of the world socialist system provided powerful support for the successful development of the national liberation movement.

The national liberation revolutions that had taken place in the era of bourgeois revolutions only removed medieval roadblocks to the development of capitalism. There was only one path of development open in that era—the capitalist path. But in the present era, because there are now two world socio-economic systems in existence, social development can take another direction—the one towards socialism. Newly independent countries are in this unique position due to the transitional character of our era, which pivots on the struggle of the two opposing systems. In the present era, national liberation revolutions can grow over into socialist revolutions. The objective prerequisite for this is the existence of the world system of socialism, which determines the main direction and the basic tendency of historical progress.

Pointing out the ways of national and social liberation for colonial and dependent countries, Lenin noted in his theses on the national and colonial question, adopted at the Second Congress of the Communist International, that "...one cannot at present confine oneself to a bare recognition or proclamation of the need for closer union between the working people of the various nations; a policy must be pursued that will achieve the closest alliance, with Soviet Russia, of all the national and colonial liberation movements. The form of this alliance should be determined by the degree of development of the communist movement in the proletariat of each country, or of the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement of the workers and peasants in backward countries or among backward nationalities."¹ Lenin underscored the fact that the alliance of the world workers' movement with the liberation struggle of oppressed people would

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Draft Theses on National and Colonial Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 146.

be enriched by new content, new forms of ties, interaction and mutual assistance.

The historical experience of the last two decades has shown that the stronger the alliance between the forces of a national liberation movement and the powerful forces of world socialism and the entire world revolutionary movement is, the more successfully are the problems of that national liberation democratic revolution developing into a socialist revolution solved. The content of this period in which a national democratic revolution develops into a socialist revolution is what constitutes the content of the non-capitalist way of development.

The term "non-capitalist development" is subjected to criticism both from the "Left" and from the Right. The "Leftists", who reject this way of development, declare it bourgeois and refuse to see the progressive character of national democratic development. The Rightists, on the other hand, consider all progressive transformation in the countries of Asia and Africa to be socialist.

Despite the shortcomings of the term "non-capitalist development", which expresses only the negative relation to capitalism, it is a most suitable term—if it is approached from other than formal positions—for describing the whole complex of socio-economic transformations being carried out in newly independent countries with a socialist orientation. We will give a fuller characterisation of the non-capitalist way of development in another section of this chapter. Whereas before, national movements developed either as bourgeois or as bourgeois-democratic movements, in the current era—the era of transition to socialism on a world scale—the national liberation struggle of the peoples has all the objective possibilities of growing over into a socialist revolution. Non-capitalist development is the revolutionary process by which a national liberation revolution gradually and consistently develops into a socialist revolution in countries where the conditions for an immediate socialist revolution have not yet matured.

Since 1966, Marxist literature has increasingly referred to countries that have set out on the non-capitalist road of development as countries with a socialist orientation.

This term entered into the Party decisions of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. In our opinion, the use of both terms is justified and they fully reflect the essence of socio-economic progress.

THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM AND ITS HISTORICAL DOOM

Capitalism today is in the midst of a general and insurmountable crisis, brought on by the aggravation of the internal contradictions of the capitalist mode of production at its final, imperialist, stage, and governed by the objective laws of social development which make inevitable mankind's ultimate transition to the progressive socio-economic system of socialism.

The national liberation revolutions in the Third World unfolded in this era of the ever-deepening crisis of capitalism, when capitalist society displays an inexorable tendency towards continuing decay. As early as 1913, Lenin explained why capitalism was the major roadblock to the social progress of peoples. "On all sides, at every step one comes across problems which man is quite capable of solving *immediately*, but capitalism is in the way. It has amassed enormous wealth—and has made men the *slaves* of this wealth. It has solved the most complicated technical problems—and has blocked the application of technical improvements because of the poverty and ignorance of millions of the population, because of the stupid avarice of a handful of millionaires.

"Civilisation, freedom and wealth under capitalism call to mind the rich glutton who is rotting alive but will not let what is young live on."¹

At the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution, the colonial power apparatus is abolished and political independence won. The revolution then runs into a large number of vitally important problems connected with the age-old economic and social backwardness of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Civilised Barbarism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 389.

newly independent countries. The main difficulties stem from the fact that these countries occupy an unequal and subordinated position in the system of international division of labour created by imperialism. Their foreign economic relations and their markets are still dominated by imperialist powers, and this seriously impedes the young countries' economic development. Imperialism continues to exploit the newly independent countries, taking a huge share of their national incomes—about 15,000 million to 20,000 million dollars a year. Calculated on the basis of the national incomes of all the imperialist and newly independent countries in 1969, the share of the developed capitalist states, in which 29 per cent of the population of the capitalist world lives, amounted to 82.2 per cent, while the share of the developing countries of the Third World, with 71 per cent of the population, amounted to only 17.8 per cent. In absolute figures, the per capita national income (1969) in the capitalist countries was 1,800 dollars, as compared to 162 dollars, or about one-twelfth as much, in the developing countries. At the same time, the per capita national income in the capitalist countries in 1969 had grown 37.4 per cent between 1960 and 1969, as compared with a growth of only 21.8 per cent in the developing countries.

The developing countries' low level of economic development, the archaic economic and social structure that still prevails in most of them, the population explosion, and continuing exploitation by imperialist monopolies, all this contributes to the unsatisfactory rates of economic development. The annual growth rate of per capita national income for the decade between 1960 and 1969 amounted to an average of 2.2 per cent, while in the period between 1950 and 1960, it had been 2.5 per cent. In the developed capitalist states this indicator was 3.6 per cent.¹

The level of development of countries is judged not only on the basis of economic growth indicators, but also on the basis of data characterising the level of education,

¹ K. Fundulis, *The Problem of Economic Independence and the Way of Non-Capitalist Development*, Varna, 1971, p. 8.

science, and culture. In the imperialist states, illiteracy rates among persons 15 years of age or older are: 2.2 per cent in the USA; 2.2 per cent in Japan; 3.3 per cent in Belgium; 3.6 per cent in France. The figures for some of the developing countries are: 87.1 per cent in Lybia; 86.2 per cent in Morocco; 72.2 per cent in India.¹ This, too, is a direct result of the protracted colonial dominance of imperialism. As noted at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969, "Imperialism is responsible for the hardship and suffering of hundreds of millions of people. It is chiefly to blame for the fact that vast masses of people in Asian, African and Latin American countries are compelled to live in conditions of poverty, disease and illiteracy and under archaic social relations, and that entire nationalities are doomed to extinction."²

The winning of political independence by the young national states of Asia and Africa and the transfer of state power into the hands of national governments opened up the possibility of extirpating the economic roots of imperialist domination and strengthening political and economic independence. The contradiction between the aspirations of the independent states to abolish their economic and cultural backwardness and the desire of imperialism to preserve it, itself compels the anti-imperialist revolution not to stop halfway. In a polemic with bourgeois economists, Lenin stressed the special significance of economic independence. "Bourgeois newspapers," he wrote, "...are talking of *national* liberation ... leaving out *economic* liberation. Yet in reality it is the latter that is the chief thing."³

All the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa are now at the stage of struggle for economic independence. One aspiration unites them—as quickly as possible

¹ M. Koptev, M. Ochkov, *Imperialism and the Developing Countries*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 41-42 (in Russian).

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 21.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Social Significance of Serbo-Bulgarian Victories", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 398.

to abolish economic backwardness. But this is not yet a qualitatively new stage of the national liberation revolution.

The new stage begins when one or another country makes a firm choice in favour of socialism, a choice which world social development—the existence and struggle of the two world socio-economic systems—has placed before every newly independent state. This objective possibility of choosing the road of social development is reflected in Africa in the formation of two groups of countries: (a) countries with a socialist orientation, which reject capitalism as a socio-economic system and pursue a policy aimed at development along non-capitalist lines, and (b) countries that are trying to achieve economic progress along the lines of capitalist development. Some countries and some political parties and their leaders feel that economic backwardness can be overcome within the system of world capitalism and through the development of private enterprise in their countries.

Other African countries have declared their goal to be the construction of a socialist society and have begun to carry out socio-economic measures in this direction. These countries are striving to reorganise the socio-economic structure inherited from the colonialists by abolishing big capitalist property—of both the foreign and comprador bourgeoisie—emancipating the peasants and carrying out social measures to improve working conditions, health protection, education, etc.

In examining the trends in capitalist development—in African countries, for example—and the political problems that emerge as a result of them, it should be kept in mind that these trends have a definite basis. Capitalism sank its roots in one form or another in Africa during the colonial period. The colonial countries were drawn into the international capitalist system of division of labour, as a result of which old modes of production began to disintegrate and a stratum took shape that was interested in the development of capitalist relations. However, capitalism was not a product of the internal development of the productive forces and production relations there. It was imported.

In addition to this imported capitalism, there has also been a spontaneous development of capitalist relations in recent years, especially in small trade, the handicraft industries, the services field, and in agriculture. After winning their independence, most countries showed an accelerated development of capitalist tendencies. This process manifested itself in the growth of a national bourgeoisie and the intensified stratification of the African peasantry.

The capitalist way of development meets the interests not only of the emerging national bourgeoisie of town and country, but also the interests of the feudal lords, the traditional leaders and the bourgeois bureaucracy, all of whom feel they can retain their privileged positions only in a bourgeois society.

Capitalism of a neo-colonial, comprador type, run in large measure by foreign interests, takes shape under the influence of imperialist forces. In Africa and other regions of the world, imperialism also creates capitalism that is wholly dependent on foreign monopolies.

The peoples of newly independent Asian and African countries have no confidence in capitalism. Their attitude towards it is connected with the dominance of foreign monopolies and imperialist colonialists, with exploitation, inequality and poverty.

But it is not only a question of capitalism's ideological crisis in the Third World. Today there are no objective conditions for the "normal", "classical" development of a capitalist society in any of the newly independent countries. Since the advent of socialism, as a new and higher social formation, all remaining pre-capitalist societies have the potential possibility of avoiding the capitalist stage of development.

How the general laws of social development that were discovered by scientific socialism manifest themselves in any particular country depends on the national and historical conditions of that country's development. However, the specific features of this development cannot negate, for example, the general law of transition from a backward formation to a progressive one, from capitalism to socialism. The objective tendencies towards social-

ism in Asia and Africa develop independently of the will of one or another socio-political force. With ever increasing momentum these tendencies are eroding the positions of capitalism, which has discredited itself both politically and economically.

The historical impotence of capitalism has manifested itself, in particular, in the fact that the national bourgeoisie in newly independent countries where it developed has been incapable of heading the national liberation movement at the second stage—the stage of struggle for economic independence. It has proved to be incapable of ensuring a high rate of economic growth, of abolishing dependence on foreign capital and of raising the living standards of the people. Highly indicative in this respect is the experience of the Arab Republic of Egypt, one of the first among the newly independent countries on the African continent to steer a course towards independent development, towards achieving economic independence.

After the revolution of 1952, the Egyptian capitalists were granted extensive privileges: customs protection of industry, reduced duties on plant and machinery imports, tax exemptions, guarantee of minimum profits, gratuitous land grants, etc. At that time, the government hoped to solve internal problems on a capitalist basis and, with the help of the national bourgeoisie, to ensure a rapid upsurge of the economy. But experience showed that private capital was not interested in developing the national economy. The state could not even induce it to take part in the ten industrial companies set up at the time with a total capital of 22,200,000 Egyptian pounds. As a result, the state was forced to invest the 12,200,000 Egyptian pounds, which by its calculations should have comprised the private capitalist share. Private capital actually sabotaged the plan for developing the country that was adopted in the summer of 1957, a plan calling for annual capital investments of 45 million Egyptian pounds.¹ The capitalists avoided fulfilling state plans,

¹ V. G. Solodovnikov, *Some Questions of the Theory and Practice of the Non-Capitalist Way of Development*, Moscow, 1971, p. 25 (in Russian).

resorted to various tricks, concealed profits, sold stock, transferred capital abroad, speculated in currency, etc. The cause of strengthening national independence and developing the national economy was in jeopardy. Finally, in July 1961, an end was put to the sabotage by a series of decrees on nationalisation. Now, the state sector embraces 85 per cent of the national production (not counting agriculture); remaining in the hands of private capital, in industry, are basically small enterprises.

As a rule, the national bourgeoisie opposes radical economic and social changes, since, objectively, they are directed against it. Although capitalism is for many African countries a higher social formation, the ideological slogans and political aims of the bourgeoisie under present conditions are nonetheless reactionary and therefore fail to win the support of the broad masses.

Attempts by imperialist propaganda to instil in the minds of the petty-bourgeois strata of the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa the idea of a possible "third way" of development have been unsuccessful. The popular masses of these countries are becoming increasingly aware that there is not and cannot be any "third way".

The President of Guinea, Sékou Touré, has stressed: "There are only two ways of development. There is the way based on the domination of private property, of private interests, i.e., on the domination of the interests of a group of proprietors who exploit the working people and live at the expense of their labour. This is the capitalist way." Guinea has chosen the other way, the non-capitalist way, which "is the expression of socialist aspirations".¹ "There is no third way between exploitation and the liquidation of exploitation," wrote the Cairo magazine *al-Hilal*. "There is no third way between private ownership and public ownership of the means of production. There is no third way between the dominance of a group of capitalists and the dominance of the people."

¹ Sékou Touré, "The Guinean Revolution and the Anti-Imperialist Struggle" in: *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4, 1967, p. 28.

BASIC CONTENT OF THE SOCIALIST ORIENTATION

The choice of the non-capitalist way of development is made as a result of the profound conviction of the revolutionary-democratic forces that it is an objective necessity. The President of Algeria, Houari Boumedienne, made the following statement in an interview given to a *Pravda* correspondent: "We consider it our duty to always stress that Algeria will never abandon the socialist choice regardless of any difficulties that lie in our way. There is no other way before Algeria besides the progressive way. Our socialist choice was supported by our people."¹

The struggle for the non-capitalist way of development reflects the continuing deepening of the socio-economic aspects of the anti-imperialist revolution. The main reason for this is the inability of capitalism to solve the socio-economic problems of the newly independent countries and the tremendous influence of the historical example of the socialist countries. By 1972, a group of Afro-Asian countries had set out on the road of non-capitalist development. These are the Arab Republic of Egypt, Algeria, Guinea, Tanzania, the People's Republic of the Congo, Syria, Iraq, Somalia, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, and Burma. Most of the countries with a socialist orientation are in Africa.

Six countries with a socialist orientation (Algeria, the Arab Republic of Egypt, Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo, Somalia and Tanzania) account for over 21 per cent of the territory of all newly independent African countries, 20 per cent of the population and over 28 per cent of the gross national product.²

The historical tendency towards non-capitalist development in Asia and Africa is becoming irreversible, by virtue of which the number of countries adopting a socialist orientation will steadily increase. The actual time, rate and extent of progressive changes in these countries will ultimately be determined by the balance of socio-

¹ *Pravda*, March 24, 1969.

² According to data in: *Etude des Conditions Economique en Afrique*, 1969, UN, New York, 1971, Partie I, E/CN. 14, Rev. 1.

political and class forces and their struggle, which comprises the basic content of the second stage of the anti-imperialist revolution and is connected above all with the choice of the way of socio-economic development.

The actual experience of national-democratic revolutions at this stage shows that the positions of revolutionary democracy have a tendency to shift closer and closer to the ideas of scientific socialism. The president of Tanzania, Julius Mwalimu Nyerere, first mentioned socialism in an article, entitled "The Future of African Nationalism", published in May 1960. But at that time he was speaking of "African socialism", the ideology and practice of which were far from scientific socialism. Further development of the idea of the socialist choice was reflected in the Constitution and Charter of the Tanganyika African National Union of 1965. The choice of the "socialist way" was officially proclaimed in the Arusha Declaration of 1967. Daudi Mwackawago, member of the Central Committee and of the National Executive Committee of the Tanganyika African National Union, stated in an address at the 24th Congress of the CPSU on April 8, 1971: "As is known, Tanzania has forever bound itself to the task of building socialism, and we believe that in carrying out this task we can derive much that is beneficial from your many years of experience, and also from the decisions of the Congress."

The evolution of the ideas of the revolutionary democrats of the Arab Republic of Egypt, notably Gamal Abdel Nasser, towards scientific socialism is most significant in this respect. After the July revolution of 1952, none of the members of the Free Officers organisation raised the question of the possibility that the country might develop along socialist lines. In an address on April 19, 1954, President Gamal Abdel Nasser even stated that the road taken by the people's democracies is not suitable for Egypt.¹

However, as resistance on the part of internal reaction increased, as certain national tasks were accomplished (the nationalisation of the Suez Canal and foreign compa-

¹ *Speeches and Statements of Gamal Abdel Nasser*, Cairo, Vol. 2, pp. 293-97 (in Arabic).

nies, the deepening of the agrarian reform, etc.), in connection with which business contacts had been established with, and effective all-round assistance was received from, the USSR and other socialist countries, the Egyptians began to speak of the necessity of adopting the socialist way of development. The idea of building a socialist society in Egypt was first expressed by Nasser in the spring of 1955, and then, two years later, on March 10, 1957, he again returned to this idea. In December 1957, at the Third Congress of Egyptian Cooperators, the President officially announced that Egypt was building a "socialist democratic cooperative society, free from exploitation".¹ The socio-economic transformations—the total nationalisation of the property of the big local bourgeoisie, the partial nationalisation of the middle bourgeoisie, and other reforms—were described as "the Egyptian road to socialism".

In June 1962, the National Congress of the Powers of the People approved the National Charter, a programme for the domestic and foreign policy of Egypt for the coming decade. The Charter read, in part: "In the countries forced to remain underdeveloped, capital in its natural development is no longer able to lead the economic drive at a time, when the great capitalist monopolies in the advanced countries develop by relying on the exploitation of the sources of wealth in the colonies.... The socialist solution to the problem of economic and social underdevelopment in Egypt—with a view to achieving progress in a revolutionary way—was never a question of free choice. The socialist solution was a historical inevitability imposed by reality, the broad aspirations of the masses and the changing nature of the world in the second part of the 20th century." The conclusion drawn from this was as follows: "Scientific socialism is the suitable style for finding the right method leading to progress. No other method can definitely achieve the desired progress."²

How did the authors of the Charter understand scientific socialism? According to their definition, socialism

¹ M. Gataullin, *The Economy of the UAR on a New Road*, Moscow, 1966, p. 90 (in Russian).

² *United Arab Republic. The Charter*, Cairo, 1962, pp. 49-50.

means "sufficiency and justice", with justice being achieved by abolishing the exploitation of man by man in all its forms and manifestations. However, their conception of "exploitation" did not include all of the kinds of exploitation practised by the owners of the means of production. Reference was being made only to so-called exploitative capital. Proclaiming "the necessity for the people's control over all the tools of production" the Charter stressed that "the people's control over all the tools of production does not necessitate the nationalisation of all means of production or the abolition of private ownership or the mere touching of the legitimate right of inheritance following therefrom".

According to the Charter, the people's control over the instruments of production is accomplished, firstly, by the creation of "a capable public sector that would lead progress in all domains" and, secondly, by the "existence of a private sector that would, without exploitation, participate in the development within the framework of the overall plan". In other words, the Charter considered it possible to preserve the petty bourgeoisie in town and country.

The Charter was against the socialisation of land. "...The right solution to the problem of agriculture," the document read, "does not lie in transforming land into public ownership but necessitates the existence of the individual ownership of land and the expansion of the ownership by providing the right to own it to the largest number of wage earners together with supporting this ownership by means of agricultural cooperation, along all the stages of the process of agricultural production."

On the whole, it was a question of using the potential of small-commodity production in the interests of Egypt's transitional economy. The Charter viewed heavy industry as the basis of the economy and unqualifiedly endorsed the principle of a planned economy: "Efficient socialist planning is the sole method which guarantees the use of all national resources."

The Charter defined the essence of democracy as follows: "Democracy is political freedom, while socialism

is social freedom. The two cannot be separated.... The freedom of voting, without the freedom of earning a living ..., loses all its value...."

The Charter characterised the Arab Socialist Union as the instrument for carrying out the social revolution—the socialist vanguard that leads the masses. People who exploit other people's labour should not be members of the Union. Nasser repeatedly warned that representatives of the exploiting classes might infiltrate into ASU. He stressed that revolutionary ideas must come from the workers and peasants and that "criticism and self-criticism are among the most important guarantees to freedom".¹

Speaking at the opening session of the National Assembly (parliament) in March 1964, Nasser said that the National Charter was not a dogma, but a method for all-round development. The Charter, he said, must be an instrument for uniting the efforts of the working people and must not turn into fetters impeding this union.²

Analysis of the National Charter—the basic programme of the ASU and the Egyptian people—shows that basically it is a revolutionary-democratic programme that provides the theoretical basis for measures which in aggregate comprise the non-capitalist way of development. What are the characteristic features of this way?

A country that sets out on the road of non-capitalist development rejects capitalism as a system, but has not yet created the conditions necessary for effecting socialist transformations. While advanced capitalism in its highest, monopoly, stage created the material prerequisites for socialism in the West, it impeded the growth of these material and technical prerequisites and this development of the productive forces in Asia and Africa through its system of colonial dominance and subjugation. The non-capitalist way is, above all, the way towards creating the material prerequisites for the building of a socialist society. Non-capitalist development is a transitional historical stage, a stage of anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist

¹ *United Arab Republic. The Charter*, p. 47.

² *Al Ahram*, March 27, 1964.

and anti-feudal transformations. The basic content of non-capitalist development does not consist of socialist but of general democratic transformations. These include undermining the domination of imperialism in the given country; gradual nationalisation of big national capital; creation of a profitable state sector; anti-feudal and agrarian transformations with the participation and in the interests of the peasants; improving the condition of all working people through progressive labour legislation; development of education and health care; providing for broader influence of the masses on state policy; regulation—and in the future, also limitation—of the development of middle and small national capital; and broad cooperation with socialist states.

Non-capitalist development starts in the political domain, and then begins to embrace the economic and cultural spheres. The first step, as a rule, is to remove the pro-imperialist, bourgeois-landowner elements from state and political power. The transition to non-capitalist development and the deep-going socio-economic changes along this road are carried out under the leadership of revolutionary democrats, who work towards these ends by strengthening their ties with the working people, remaining true to their interests and ensuring their genuine democratic freedoms.

One of the main conditions for progress along the non-capitalist road of development is the existence in the country of a vanguard revolutionary party that would direct this development in accordance with the basic principles of scientific socialism. A country with a socialist orientation pursues a foreign policy aimed at strengthening ties with the world socialist system, which regards cooperation with such countries as a form of proletarian internationalism.

These were exactly the prospects that Marx and Engels had pointed out for peoples lagging in their historical development. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin provided the concrete solution to the theoretical problems of non-capitalist development. This solution, reflected in the political programme of the Communist Party, would make socialism accessible

to the peoples of the former tsarist empire who were at that time at a pre-capitalist (tribal-clan or feudal) stage of development. In contrast to the opportunists from the Second International and the Russian Mensheviks, who asserted that revolutionary action by the masses could be successful only in developed capitalist countries, Lenin opened up the prospect of achieving socialism to the multimillion masses, above all, the peasantry, in the colonial world.

The experience of the USSR, the Mongolian People's Republic and other countries that began building a socialist society under conditions where pre-capitalist forms of economy prevailed shows, firstly, that the non-capitalist way to socialism begins with the creation of a revolutionary party standing on the principles of scientific socialism, changes in the superstructure and the establishment of a political regime that ensures the victory of the forces with a socialist orientation. It shows, secondly, that backward peoples who choose the socialist direction in their development cannot do without the international support and assistance of the more developed socialist countries. This Leninist proposition must always be kept in mind.

A most important condition for success along the non-capitalist way is that careful attention be paid to the national features of each people and nationality. Lenin drew attention to this repeatedly. On October 27, 1922, he said: "Our five years' experience in settling the national question in a country that contains a tremendous number of nationalities such as could hardly be found in any other country, gives us the full conviction that ... the only correct attitude to the interests of nations is to meet those interests in full and provide conditions that exclude any possibility of conflicts on that score. Our experience has left us with the firm conviction that only exclusive attention to the interests of various nations can remove grounds for conflicts, can remove mutual mistrust, can remove the fear of any intrigues and create that confidence, especially on the part of workers and peasants ... without which there absolutely cannot be peaceful relations between peoples or anything like a successful development

of everything that is of value in present-day civilisation."¹

This experience was successfully realised by the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP). In his article, "In the Vanguard of the Mongolian People", T. Dugersuren, member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CC MPRP, concretises the tasks of the MPRP at the stage of non-capitalist development. He states: "At this stage, the Party saw its main tasks to be the complete abolishment of the class of feudal lords, the complete ousting of foreign capital from the country's economy, and the creation of the foundations of a new, non-capitalist national economy.... Taking into account the deep religiousness of the masses and the specific features of stratification within the lamaist hierarchy, the Party and the Government pursued an extremely cautious policy with respect to this ideologically influential and organised force."²

During that period, the foundations of the state and cooperative sectors of the Mongolian economy were laid, and industrialisation and long-range national economic planning were begun. The MPRP also scored successes in the solution of the complex problem of organising peasant farms into cooperatives. These successes, which found expression in the late 1950s in the voluntary mass joining of cattle-breeders into agricultural associations, were achieved by carrying out the far-sighted policy of the Party. On the one hand, the MPRP made maximal use of the economic possibilities of individual farms under conditions where a small-commodity economy prevailed, and, on the other hand, followed a consistent course towards restricting capitalist elements under these conditions and preventing their growth. As a result, with the assistance and under the control of the state, socialist ownership of the means of production became the stable economic basis of the entire Mongolian society.

The profound socio-economic changes in Mongolia were also organically connected with the cultural revolution,

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Interview Given to *Observer* Correspondent", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 386.

² See *World Marxist Review* No. 2, 1971, pp. 42-43.

the chief aim of which was to emancipate the masses from their spiritual bondage to the feudal lords and give them access to all the achievements of modern science and art. Universal primary education for the children of peasants and a seven-year education in the city were introduced. Public health care was developed and the living standard of the people rose. The tasks of the general democratic stage of revolution—the non-capitalist stage—had been completed by 1940. That year, the Tenth Congress of the MPRP adopted a new Party programme, defining the basic tasks for transition from the general democratic stage to the socialist stage of the revolution.

Present-day non-capitalist development in Asia and Africa is a qualitatively new phenomenon. It takes place within the framework of the world capitalist economy and under conditions of competition between two socio-economic systems. This development introduces many new elements into the general principle of "by-passing" the capitalist formation and enriches the theory and practice of non-capitalist development.

RECENT EXPERIENCE OF ECONOMIC CHANGES ALONG NON-CAPITALIST LINES

The main strategic aim of non-capitalist development is to create the material, technical, social and political conditions for transition to socialism. The achievement of this goal is an extremely difficult and complex matter. To achieve socialism, as Lenin wrote, "an enormous step forward must be taken in the development of the productive forces..."¹ Colonialism impeded and disfigured this development. Standing before every country with a socialist orientation is the task of building a national economy, and it must cope with this task under conditions of struggle against imperialism. The decisive role in this struggle is played by the state sector.

The state sector is growing in all the developing countries. The economic policy of countries oriented

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 421.

towards capitalism is based on private initiative. At the same time, the weakness of local private capital compels the ruling circles of these countries to use the state for developing those branches of the economy that require large capital investments. Also, the state sector in countries with a capitalist orientation develops above all by virtue of limitations placed on foreign capital. This particular feature of the economic development of this group of countries bears some resemblance to the development of states with a socialist orientation. But unlike the latter, the state sector in countries with a capitalist orientation serves the aims of a growing bourgeoisie and embraces only a limited number of branches or sub-branches of the economy.

In countries following the non-capitalist path, however, the state sector has a different—a revolutionary socio-economic—content. Developing on anti-capitalist principles, it is designed to create the material prerequisites for the ultimate transition to a socialist reconstruction of the economy. In the independent countries oriented towards socialism, the state sector, as Leonid Brezhnev has pointed out, “is essential as an economic basis for a revolutionary-democratic policy”.¹

The necessity of developing the state sector in countries with a socialist orientation follows from the very essence of non-capitalist development. Through it the state mobilises the means for overcoming great backwardness, for restructuring the economy and creating its modern branches. The state sector makes it possible to introduce economic planning. It is the basis for eliminating the domination of foreign capital and achieving economic independence. Its development has an impact on the basic processes of the national-liberation revolution.

In the countries with a socialist orientation this revolution is accompanied by profound economic changes, the effective instrument of which is the state sector. The scope of this sector's expansion depends on the level of development at which the country stands.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 24.

In *Egypt*, advances in the development of the national economy were facilitated by a number of economic and political factors. First of all, it should be remembered that in comparison with other countries that had freed themselves from colonialism, Egypt was on a relatively high initial level of economic development. Prior to 1952, she had 134,000 industrial and handicrafts enterprises, a developed light and food industry, a large number of repair enterprises, and a good transportation network.

The 1952 revolution was a bourgeois-democratic revolution. The country began to develop along the capitalist road. The first political and economic reforms were of a bourgeois character. However, it soon became clear that the national bourgeoisie was striving only for its own personal enrichment and not for the development of the country's productive forces. In 1956, the Egyptian Government began the gradual implementation of measures aimed at developing the state sector.

The 1956 reforms laid the basis for the socialist orientation of the country and its subsequent economic and social progress. The decisive role in this process was played by the profound socio-political transformations that were effected: the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, banks, insurance companies, industrial enterprises, and wholesale and foreign trade belonging to foreign and big local capital, as well as the implementation of an agrarian reform. A strong state sector was created, with a fairly efficient apparatus to manage it. The state sector accounts for about 85 per cent of the country's industrial production, and the state controls the prices on 90 per cent of the goods produced for the home market. Another important factor contributing to successful economic construction was the significant inflow of resources from abroad, and above all the all-round assistance of the socialist countries.

As is the case with other socialist-oriented countries, Egypt's road to building a socialist society is neither easy nor short. The process of non-capitalist development cannot take place without an aggravation of the class struggle, temporary zigzags and retreats. The main reasons for the instability and inconsistency that we

see in the implementation of anti-capitalist measures in some of the countries with a socialist orientation, the ARE for one, are to be found in the petty-bourgeois and peasant nature of these countries and their ruling parties, the low level of the working class's political and ideological awareness, the inability of many revolutionary democrats to abandon their nationalistic sentiments, and the stubborn resistance to the socialist orientation put up by imperialist and reactionary circles. "In the land in which the small-proprietor population greatly predominates over the purely proletarian population," Lenin wrote, "the difference between the proletarian revolutionary and petty-bourgeois revolutionary will inevitably make itself felt, and from time to time will make itself felt very sharply. The petty-bourgeois revolutionary wavers and vacillates at every turn of events..."¹

In *Algeria*, the overall gross national product for 1970 had not yet come up to the 1960 level. This was due, above all, to the consequences of the colonial war fought on Algerian soil between 1954 and 1962, at the cost of great human sacrifices and material destruction. Moreover, the Algerian economy had been disorganised and weakened by the mass exodus of French specialists, skilled workers and farmers, as well as by the transfer of capital to France after the country won its independence. Thus the initial economic basis was weaker and narrower in Algeria than in Egypt; however, it was on a much higher level [than that of most countries of Tropical Africa.

Algeria possesses rich and varied natural resources and a developed infrastructure. The Algerian economy is favourably affected by the fact that the Algerian Government derives substantial revenue from French and other oil companies operating in the country, putting Algeria in a better monetary and financial position than other African countries.

It should also be pointed out that despite the drop in the overall volume of Algeria's gross product in the years

following the winning of independence, the living standard of the indigenous population rose in comparison with the colonial period, because the major part of this product was now being placed at the disposal of Algerians.

Significant socio-economic changes have already been made in Algeria. The state sector has been established and embraces the basic kinds of transport and power and a considerable part of industry, finance and credit. The self-regulating sector—a new form of public ownership born as a result of the revolutionary initiative of the working people—embraces market-oriented farms that account for about 66 per cent of the country's agricultural production.

By the early 1970s, the public sector (the state, self-regulating and cooperative sectors) accounted for 80 per cent (in terms of value) of the industrial production (not counting oil production), 60 per cent of the agricultural production, and 100 per cent of the internal freight cartage. At present, the oil industry is gradually coming under state control. In 1969, the state-owned Sonatrach Company accounted for 13 per cent of the country's oil extraction. On February 24, 1971, the head of the Algerian Government, Houari Boumedienne, announced a decree nationalising the sources and extraction of natural gas and transferring 51 per cent of the shares of foreign oil companies to the Algerian state. Attaching great importance to these measures, Houari Boumedienne stated that "the revolution has today entered the oil sector".¹

The nationalisation of gas and the establishment of control over foreign oil companies, which sharply limited the possibilities and influence of foreign capital, evoked the discontent and resistance of the latter. But the working people of Algeria expressed broad support for the Algerian Government in the struggle against foreign capital. This struggle is not over, of course, but an important battle has already been won. An important contributing factor was the strengthening of economic cooperation between Algeria and the socialist countries. Algeria

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 276.

¹ *Jeune Afrique*, March 16, 1971, p. 26.

also skillfully used Franco-American rivalry in the struggle for oil and gas.

The public sector plays an important role in the insurance business, the internal oil and petroleum-products trade, the banking business, foreign trade, etc. At the same time, a major branch of industry—oil extraction—still remains largely in joint possession of the foreign—primarily French—and state sectors. Foreign and local capitalists still hold strong positions in the manufacturing industry, the internal wholesale trade and foreign trade. But the blow struck to foreign capital in the gas and oil industries significantly strengthens the positions of the state sector.

In the so-called traditional sector of agriculture, in which the greater part of the rural population of Algeria is employed, few changes have been made. The basic economic and social task now is to carry out an agrarian reform in the interests of those who work the land.

The economy of *Tanzania* developed at a relatively high rate in the period between 1960 and 1970, when the gross national product grew at an average rate of 3.2 per cent per year. The foundations were laid for a national manufacturing industry, and oil refineries, a cement plant, an auto assembly plant, and enterprises of the light and food industries were built. In 1968, the total number of industrial enterprises, including small ones, exceeded 5,000, as compared with 2,000 in 1951.¹ The situation in agriculture also improved, despite the fact that the production of sisal—the main industrial crop of Tanzania—suffered heavily from an unfavourable situation on the world markets. Compared with 1960, the production of cotton, coffee, sugar cane, cashew nuts, tea, tobacco and wheat has increased.

Pursuant to the Arusha Declaration, foreign banks, insurance companies and some agricultural plantations, industrial enterprises and trading companies were nationalised in 1967. Subsequently, however, pressure from

¹ *Shifts Taking Place in African Countries After the Proclamation of Independence and Recent Trends in Development*, Moscow, 1968, Book I (mimeographed), p. 173 (in Russian).

foreign capital forced the government to pay compensation to foreign owners and limit the scope of nationalisation. Tanzania's economy and, in particular, her manufacturing industry, continues to grow at a rapid rate. The government's industrial policy envisages the accomplishment of two tasks. Firstly, Tanzania wants to become self-sufficient in goods that are now imported but could be produced by her own national industry. Secondly, she plans in the near future to achieve the industrial level of neighbouring East African countries in order to have a firm basis for expanding active cooperation with them.¹

The government of Tanzania is carrying out a vast programme of organising the rural population into co-operatives. The slogan advanced in the country calls for the creation of "villages of ujamaa" ("villages of socialism") based on communal traditions familiar to Africans but conducting their economic affairs on a modern commodity basis with minimal state assistance and maximum reliance in their own efforts. In actual practice—already created are over 6,000 villages of ujamaa in which 25 per cent of the entire population of the country live—the creation of these villages has resulted in the rapid decline of the obsolete communal structure and helps implant modern co-operative principles in the rural regions of Tanzania.

Among the features of non-capitalist development in Tanzania, the following should be noted: a) a flexible and cautious policy towards foreign capital; b) stress on internal resources and approach to foreign sources as supplementary; c) organisation of the peasants into big "socialist villages"; d) a broad cultural revolution, with large-scale building of schools, hospitals, cultural centres, etc.; e) the combating of bribery and corruption.

In the *People's Republic of the Congo* (capital, Brazzaville), the gross national product in the period between 1960 and 1968 increased on an average of 2.5 per cent per year. It should be noted, however, that this is a country with a very small population (less than 1,000,000) and

¹ *Tanzania. Second Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development (1969-1974)*, Dar es Salaam, 1969, Vol. 1, pp. 3-5.

an extremely low initial economic level. Most of the rural population lives under conditions of a natural economy. The country depends heavily on foreign trade, with imports satisfying two-thirds of its needs in industrial goods.

The manufacturing industry is weakly developed. Among the large industrial enterprises built in the mid-1960s are plants of the food industry (a sugar plant and a cannery) and a cement and potash plant.

At the end of 1969 and beginning of 1971, the Government of the Congo inaugurated some profound socio-economic changes. Nationalisation of foreign enterprises in the sugar industry and in transportation was carried out on a broad scale, thus strengthening the state sector.

Beginning in January 1964, taxes were raised on trading, industrial and agricultural companies. This measure made it possible to set aside a portion of the private sector's income for purposes of internal state accumulation.

From the very beginning of its existence, the ruling Congolese Labour Party proclaimed scientific socialism to be its ideological basis and defined its goal to be the building of socialism in the future. At an extraordinary congress in late 1972 it adopted a new programme in which it was stressed that the party would base its work on the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The economic growth rates of some newly independent countries with a socialist orientation are still low.

The growth rates of a number of countries developing along capitalist lines were higher in the 60s than the average rates in countries with a socialist orientation. Imperialist propaganda tries to speculate on this in order to discredit the socialist orientation and to convince the peoples of Asia and Africa that the Leninist conception of non-capitalist development is inapplicable to the conditions prevailing in these continents.

However, a temporary retardation of economic growth rates in countries with a socialist orientation is an objectively natural phenomenon. The transition from old economic relations, especially from such archaic relations as existed in the countries of Africa, to a new system of

social relations is an extremely complex process. The new system cannot produce a positive effect immediately, but it does guarantee stable long-range prospects for social and economic progress.

Another fact that should be taken into account is that in the countries with a capitalist orientation, especially those rich in mineral resources, the growth of national income stems largely from a rapid growth of foreign investments and is thus accompanied by a further subordination of the economy to foreign capital. In these countries it is primarily the number of foreign enterprises that is growing, while the national industry develops very slowly. Hence, economic development in this case is of an anti-national character; it leads to the countries' greater and greater economic dependence on the imperialist powers. This is neo-colonial development.

There is another reason for the faster growth of the national income in countries developing along capitalist lines. It has to do with the distribution of budget resources. The countries with a socialist orientation spend more on social needs, on the development of culture and science. For example, in the period 1955-66, expenditures for national needs in Egypt amounted to 20.7 per cent of all capital investments, and in Algeria—even 65 per cent, while in Morocco this figure was 11 per cent, in Ethiopia, 4.1 per cent, in Kenya, 17 per cent, and in the Ivory Coast, 13 per cent.¹

Private foreign capital avoids investment in the social spheres and the infrastructure. It is directed primarily to those fields where it can derive maximum profits or seize important sources of raw materials. Therefore, the economic growth rates may seem higher in the countries with a capitalist orientation than in the countries with a socialist orientation, but the living standards of the working people there are lower than in the countries with a socialist orientation.

Thus, when we speak of the advantages of one way of development over another, we must base our conclusions on a comprehensive evaluation, taking into consideration

¹ V. G. Solodovnikov, *Some Questions of the Theory and Practice of the Non-Capitalist Way of Development*, p. 55.

not only the growth rate of the national income, but also such factors as to what extent the national economy is strengthened and foreign dependence is weakened, what changes are taking place in the social structure of the population, how the nationalities question is being solved, what progress is being made in culture and science, and what improvements there are in the living standard of the people.

To be sure, economic achievements are a stabilising factor. An analysis of how the economic programmes of the countries developing along non-capitalist lines are being carried out, and a study of their material potential in combination with such factors as the rational and effective use of foreign credits and, above all, assistance from the socialist states, will show that in the near future these countries will achieve relatively high rates of economic development, accompanied by a systematic rise in the standard of living of the working people. In the process, the regimes pursuing a policy of non-capitalist development will become even more firmly established, and their prestige as well as their influence on the whole anti-imperialist revolution in Asia and Africa will grow immeasurably.

The experience of the struggle against neo-colonialism in the Third World shows that liberation from foreign dependence is impossible without the nationalisation of banks, the creation of independent financial and currency systems, establishment of control over raw material resources and key industries, and the assignment of national cadres to key government posts. While supporting the demand for limiting the activity of foreign capital, Marxists-Leninists at the same time understand that the problem of a newly independent country's attitude to foreign capital and foreign property is extremely complex. There are no ready-made, pat recommendations on this score. A summary analysis of the concrete experience may reveal certain general patterns, but when it comes to the practical solution of the question of attitude to foreign capital, account should be taken of the concrete conditions of the given system and the international situation in general.

At present, the social and economic development plans of most of the Asian and African countries with a socialist orientation as a rule envisage only measures aimed at restricting foreign capital, above all in large- and medium-scale industry. These countries generally begin with a policy of inviting foreign capital for the development of the national economy under state control. However, when foreign capital ignores the national interests the governments of the developing countries resort to the extreme measure of nationalising it. This is what happened in Egypt, Algeria, Tanzania and other countries.

The question is not whether or not to attract private foreign capital for the development of the national economy. The question is, *on what conditions* it should be attracted. While favouring Soviet Russia's offering concessions to foreign capitalists, Lenin wrote: "The whole difficulty with concessions is giving the proper consideration and appraisal of all the circumstances when concluding a concession agreement, and then seeing that it is fulfilled."¹

In attracting foreign capital into a country it must be deprived of the possibility of interfering in the political life of the country. In short, foreign capital must restrict itself to receiving a reasonable return on its investments.

The non-capitalist way of development implies the proportional development of the national economy on a planned basis, the organisation of peasants and artisans into cooperatives in the interests of the broad masses of working people, and, subsequently, the industrialisation of the country, the reconstruction of agriculture, the training of national cadres, and the application of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in the interests of the people. The non-capitalist road of development can be taken by countries on an extremely low level of capitalist development as well as by countries on a medium level of capitalist development. Despite the fact that all the countries on the non-capitalist road of development retain a petty and even a middle bourgeoisie and that foreign companies continue

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tax in Kind", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 347.

to operate, albeit under the control and with the participation of the state, the general law of their development is the growth of the anti-capitalist tendency, which ultimately becomes the main tendency of social development, to which the whole system of economic relations with foreign and local private capital is subordinated. The use of capital for the purpose of developing the national economy is nothing other than the continuation of the class struggle in other forms. Lenin stressed that "concessions are also a form of struggle, and are a continuation of the class struggle in another form, and in no circumstances are they a substitution of class peace for class war".¹

Loss of control over capitalist elements can place the non-capitalist course of development in jeopardy. An example of this is Tunisia, where virtually nothing is left of the proclaimed "Destour socialism" and capitalist elements have taken the upper hand. The same thing happened in Kenya with the "economic socialism" proclaimed by KANU.

To prevent development from taking this course it is most important to study the experience of the USSR during the period of the New Economic Policy (NEP). Of great practical significance are Lenin's theoretical grounds for the necessity of this policy at that time, the development of its methods, the actions of the Soviet government in this sphere, that is, everything that made it possible to turn NEP into a means of strengthening the socialist positions in the country.

The leaders of the revolutionary-democratic parties in countries developing along non-capitalist lines need to have a profound knowledge of the laws according to which peoples develop along socialist lines and great personal experience in leading the masses. Non-capitalist development requires a purposeful, scientifically grounded policy, and careful consideration of a multitude of economic, social and political factors.

Experience in successfully solving economic development problems shows that the plans and the political

and ideological measures in the countries with a socialist orientation must take into account the real possibilities and the consequences of their realisation. Hasty industrialisation or attempts to organise peasants into co-operatives without due preparation, as well as premature nationalisation of foreign property, can have a damaging effect on the productive forces and the policy of socialist orientation.

Development along non-capitalist lines inevitably runs into difficulties and social conflicts. This is something that political parties have to foresee. In politics, a straight line is not always the shortest. The main thing in the party's policy is to find the optimal solutions.

Accumulated experience also shows how important it is for the political parties of countries with a socialist orientation to propagandise their economic and social programmes, because the first steps in industrialisation and transformations in agriculture and other economic spheres are always connected with economic and psychological difficulties for the population and certain sacrifices. A great deal of explanatory work among the working people must be done. The working people must come to understand that the struggle against backwardness is their struggle and that it requires the efforts of the entire nation, a high level of labour discipline, strict economy, the labour and revolutionary enthusiasm of the people, and the mastery by the working people of the science of management.

We know, for example, that overcoming one-sided specialisation based on the production of a single agricultural product or raw material (for example, coffee or cocoa) requires restructuring the activity of many small producers, organising them into cooperatives, introducing new kinds of agricultural crops that call for different agronomical practices and are produced for new consumers, for the national market, etc. It is advisable, therefore, to preserve such traditional specialisation for a certain period of time, and to use the foreign currency derived from the export of this product for the purpose of developing other necessary and profitable branches of the country's economy. A good example in this respect

¹ Ibid., p. 346.

is Cuba, where sugar production has been developed in every way possible. On the money received from the sale of sugar, Cuba buys the machines and equipment she needs and develops new branches of production. Many oil-producing countries use the income from oil exports to develop other branches of the economy. Algeria's Minister of Industry and Power Belaid Abdessalam expressed this idea well when he said, "It is necessary to sow oil in order to reap industry."

Large capital investments are required to create a national industry. But the African countries have little national capital, and because their economies are underdeveloped, the rate of capital accumulation is low. The creation of modern industrial enterprises, which are profitable only when they are in mass production, is also hampered by the low purchasing power of the population and the narrowness of the internal market. The developing countries thus find themselves in a kind of vicious circle, the way out of which is to carry out cardinal socio-economic transformations that open up possibilities for progress.

Wide use is made of government regulation to protect nascent industries from foreign competition. This can take various forms, such as banning the import of certain goods, introducing high duties, etc. To stop the outflow of resources from the country, the developing states sometimes have to stop or limit the export of profits by foreign companies. Such protection from foreign exploitation is an objective necessity for developing countries. The experience of the USSR, the Mongolian People's Republic and other socialist countries testifies to this. Moreover, all the modern industrial countries of the West have gone through this stage to one degree or another. The imperialist states and foreign companies, however, have no wish to reckon with the national interests of the developing countries; they demand free access into these countries for their products and unlimited export of profits, thus creating additional problems in the economic development of these countries.

All of these problems—in particular, the shortage of national cadres, unemployment, the initial unprofitability

ty of the state sector, financial and food dependence on imperialism—are the consequence of prolonged colonial domination, brutal imperialist exploitation and the policy of neo-colonialism. Hence, their solution is connected with stringent measures aimed at eliminating the consequences of colonial dominance in the economic and social spheres and restricting imperialist exploitation.

The imperialist countries constantly use the economic dependence of the countries with a socialist orientation for purposes of political blackmail and pressure, fighting all anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist measures, attacking the state sector, etc.

The imperialists and internal reactionary forces sometimes succeed in turning one or another country away from the non-capitalist road of development and placing it under their control.

However, the experience of countries with a socialist orientation shows that when their ruling circles rest on the support of the broad masses of working people and on all-round cooperation with the world socialist system, neo-colonialism does not achieve its aims. This experience dictates that the political parties of countries with a socialist orientation manifest unfaltering decisiveness in instituting internal social transformations in the interests of the broad working masses. Inconsistency in home and foreign policy is fraught with dangerous consequences for the cause of revolutionary transformations.

Educational work among the masses is an objective necessity during the transition to socialism and the creation of prerequisites for building a socialist society. It is far from enough merely to proclaim that the country has chosen the non-capitalist way of development. What is needed is purposeful education of the masses in the socialist spirit. A cultural revolution or cultural transformations, the education of the new man—these are part and parcel of the struggle for non-capitalist development.

Without a revolutionary ideology and a correct political line it is impossible to build a society on new principles. Lenin stated, "Politics must take precedence over economics. To argue otherwise is to forget the ABC of Marxism."

...Without a correct political approach to the matter the given class will be unable to stay on top...."¹

When the champions of capitalist development propagandise their system in Asia and Africa, they usually refer to the economically advanced states of Europe and America and ignore the historical experience of many Latin American countries that won their political independence in the mid-19th century, but still find themselves in dependence on American imperialism. Yet it is precisely the Latin American countries that have so much in common with the Afro-Asian countries.

Industrialisation in the West in the 19th century was carried out, as we know, at the price of the fierce exploitation of a given country's own working people and the physical destruction of millions of other people as a result of the wide development of slave trade and colonial exploitation. A vast body of material about the brutal methods of primary accumulation of capital in the then developing and now advanced capitalist countries is contained in official reports and in the literature of that time and, in particular, in Marx's *Capital*.

Such an approach to industrialisation is unacceptable to a socialist country; it is also unacceptable in a country that has embarked on the road of non-capitalist development. Overcoming economic backwardness is a difficult task under any conditions. Industrialisation in the USSR required of the Soviet people a tremendous exertion of all their material and intellectual forces. The great advantage of non-capitalist development, however, is that it can assure economic growth while taking into strict account the interests of all classes and social groups allied with revolutionary democracy, which means, above all, the interests of the working class, the small and middle peasants and the working intelligentsia. The problem of developing the productive forces in a socialist society is resolved on the basis of the public ownership of the means of production, which excludes the stratification of the society and the formation of antagonistic classes.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Once Again on the Trade Unions", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 83-84.

The experience of the countries with a socialist orientation provides convincing evidence that the non-capitalist way offers every possibility for balanced and progressive solutions to all the contradictions and problems inherited from colonialism and the old traditional society; capitalist development, on the other hand, only aggravates these contradictions, inevitably makes their positive solution impossible, and brings them to the point of explosion.

In countries with a socialist orientation, favourable conditions are created for activating the working people. The masses of working people take part in the work of political parties, trade unions and other public mass organisations. They are drawn into the work of state administration, enter into the higher organs of power, into the leading bodies of the parties, etc. For this reason, it may be said that a characteristic feature of countries with a socialist orientation is a broader participation of the working people—workers, peasants and working intelligentsia—in the political and social life of the country and their higher political enthusiasm and resolve to struggle for a new life based on just principles. The active participation of the broad masses of working people in the struggle for a socialist orientation, their readiness to defend the gains of non-capitalist development is a necessary condition for bringing the pre-socialist stage to a successful conclusion.

THE MOTIVE FORCES OF SOCIALIST ORIENTATION. NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT—A FORM OF CLASS STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM

One of the main propositions of scientific socialism is that the class struggle is a law of the development of antagonistic societies, that not a single exploiter class will give up its privileged positions voluntarily, without resistance, and that the working people cannot become the full masters of their country and achieve happiness and prosperity without a vigorous and consistent struggle against the exploiter classes.

Many Arab and African revolutionary democrats once felt that this Marxist proposition was not applicable to their countries, and consequently adhered to their own conceptions of "national socialism". These conceptions were engendered above all by the low level of development of class relations in the African society, and also by the fact that at the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution, all classes and all social strata came out in a united front against colonialism.

This unity of action at the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution was taken by many African leaders and theorists as evidence that the Marxist thesis on the class struggle does not fit the situation in African countries.

■ In time, however, class contradictions grew deeper and the class struggle became sharper in all the countries that freed themselves from colonialism. As the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stressed: "Social differentiation is developing in the newly

independent countries. There is a sharpening conflict between the working class, the peasantry and other democratic forces, including patriotic-minded sections of the petty bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and, on the other, imperialism and the forces of domestic reaction, the elements of the national bourgeoisie which are increasingly accepting a deal with imperialism."¹ The very logic of the national-democratic revolution has prompted many leaders of the national revolutionary democracy to re-examine their position.

In the late 1950s Gamal Abdel Nasser, for example, said that the Government of Egypt was counting on "removing class contradictions by peaceful means", by "compromise with reaction on a national basis". "We thought," he stressed subsequently, "that despite the difference between us and the reactionary elements, they are the sons of the same country and brothers-in-arms in the struggle for its future."²

But the facts of life eventually convinced revolutionary democrats that there can be no "class peace" between the exploited and the exploiters. When revolutionary changes in the Egyptian countryside affected the privileges of the feudal lords, they began to offer fierce resistance to the peasants. Their agents attacked party activists and there were cases of physical violence against them. In the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, hirelings of the feudal lords made armed attacks on peasant committees. The capitalists and feudal lords use every means possible to retain their dominance—sabotage of measures instituted by the revolutionary regime, plots against it in collusion with imperialism, blackmail, bribery, intrigues. "Experience has shown that we were wrong," said Nasser in the beginning of the 1960s. "Reaction, on which imperialism relies, does not hesitate in robbing the struggling people of its social gains.... We wanted the revolution to be white in the name of justice. But through the fault of reaction, which strove to retain its

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 28.

² *Al Katib*, November 1970, p. 168.

dominance, it became red with blood."¹ The National Charter of 1962 already stressed that "the alliance of reaction and exploiting capital must fall", that "the inevitable and natural struggle between classes cannot be ignored and denied". Many revolutionary democrats in Algeria, Guinea and other newly independent countries came to the same conclusion. President Sékou Touré of Guinea, for example, has stressed that "the class struggle is becoming a form of relations between those who aspire to progress and those who hope to use power to the detriment of the working people".²

Thus, many revolutionary democrats have already embraced ideologically and politically one of the most important propositions of scientific socialism, namely, that the motive force of social revolutions is the class struggle. Mobilising the working people for class struggle against foreign and national oppressors, the revolutionary democrats are scoring success after success on the road to building a new life.

ON THE ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS

The working class is the most consistent and resolute opponent of imperialism and internal reaction, a staunch fighter for the cause of socialism, the vehicle of socialist ideas. The entire experience of the international revolutionary workers' movement testifies to this. In most of the newly independent Asian and African countries, the working class is small in numbers. Factory workers in these countries make up an average of about 2 to 3 per cent of the population, and in a number of states of Tropical Africa there is virtually no proletariat at all.³ However, the political weight of the proletariat, its ability to influence the socio-political development of its country is not determined by its size in numbers.

¹ Ibid., pp. 168-69.

² 8 Congrès National du Parti Démocratique de Guinée, Conakry, September 25-October 2, 1967.

³ G. Khan, *Some Problems of the Non-Capitalist Way of Development*, Alma Ata, 1974, p. 85 (in Russian); K. A. Guseinov, *The Working Class and Trade Unions of Africa*, Moscow, 1969, p. 8 (in Russian).

Lenin refuted Karl Kautsky's thesis that the working class had to comprise the majority of the population in order for a socialist revolution to be carried out and the transition to socialism made. Lenin pointed out that what was necessary was for the allies of the proletariat—the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the middle strata—to unite around the proletariat and its party. All these classes and strata are exploited by imperialism; they are natural allies of the working class in the struggle against capital and reaction. Therefore, the socialist revolution, as Lenin stressed, can win out in countries where the proletariat makes up the minority of the population, but has allies that unite with it to fight against imperialism and work for social progress.

This proposition fully applies to the countries of Asia and Africa. It should be pointed out that in the newly independent countries, especially in Africa, there are still factors operating that hinder the consolidation of the proletariat as a class. For example, a considerable part of the industrial workers are scattered because of the existence of small enterprises. Many workers have not broken their ties with the countryside and are under the power of tribal and religious dogmas.

It should be noted, however, that in the present era, the formation of the proletariat's self-awareness in the developing countries of Asia and Africa is proceeding considerably faster than was the case, say, in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries. This is explained by the sharp intensification of political struggle in the Afro-Asian countries after they attained their independence, and by the wide dissemination of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. The building of large modern industrial enterprises, now in progress in the developing countries with a socialist orientation, leads to a rapid numerical growth of the working class and definite qualitative changes, such as its becoming more concentrated, better organised and self-aware. The workers' movement in Asia and Africa has the possibility of drawing on the experience and support of the working class of the countries in the world socialist system and the whole international revolutionary workers' movement. All this streng-

thens the position of the proletariat in countries where it is still small in numbers.

The workers of the newly independent countries took an active part in the struggle against colonial oppression and the fight for political independence; the working class of these countries is destined to play an even bigger role in the struggle for socio-political and economic progress.

Algerian workers, for example, made a big contribution to the cause of rebuilding their country's economy. At their own initiative, they took over agricultural and industrial enterprises abandoned by the colonialists and set up self-management committees to run them. The famous decrees on self-management adopted by the Algerian Government in March 1963 consolidated the results of the working people's creative actions. With the backing of the workers, the self-management committees were able to overcome many hardships and move forward in the job of rebuilding and developing the country's war-ravaged economy.

In Algeria, Syria, the Congo (Brazzaville) and elsewhere, the workers, united in trade unions, take an active part in effecting socio-political and economic transformations. In recent years, the trade union movement in Egypt has become increasingly active. The working class has already won improvements in working conditions, higher wages and the enactment of labour legislation.

After industrial enterprises were nationalised between 1961 and 1963, Egyptian workers received the right to have their elected representatives sit on the boards of directors of their enterprises. Employees of state, private and mixed enterprises won the right to control 25 per cent of their enterprises' profits, 10 per cent to be distributed among the workers, 10 per cent to be earmarked for their social needs, and 5 per cent turned over to their trade union organisations. In 1964, the National Assembly of Tanzania adopted a resolution on the establishment of workers' committees at every enterprise. Their function included reviewing, jointly with employers or the enterprise management, questions of production discipline,

raising labour productivity, and proper observance of labour laws.

A big gain for the workers' movement in the countries with a socialist orientation has been the enactment of social insurance legislation. In Egypt, pensions are paid out of social insurance funds to which employers, workers and the state contribute. In Tanzania, an old-age insurance fund has been created to which employers and workers each contribute 5 per cent of wages. In Guinea, the employer's contribution is 3 per cent of his profit, and the worker's is 1.5 per cent of his wages.

Progressive national democrats in countries with a socialist orientation realise that the active involvement of the working class and all working people is indispensable if the cause of effecting social and economic transformation is to succeed. The Algerian Charter—the programme document of the Algerian revolution—stresses that social and economic development is inconceivable “without the conscious participation and active cooperation of the workers”. The Arusha Declaration of Tanzania states: “To build and strengthen socialism it is necessary that the basic means of production belong to the peasants and workers and be under their control. ...It is also necessary that the ruling party be a party of workers and peasants.” In 1964, President Nasser, speaking before the National Assembly, said: “Egypt has succeeded in effecting great political and social changes not only in terms of destroying the exploiting classes, but also in terms of firmly establishing the new status of the working class. Before the revolution, the working class was small and subjected to merciless exploitation. Now it is much bigger. It is the working class that now represents the socialist system.”¹

After Nasser's death (1970) the reactionary forces stepped up their activity and are using every means to undermine and abolish Egypt's socialist orientation. These forces are trying to push the country towards the right and to re-establish the neo-colonialist order there.

Non-capitalist development in Asia and Africa and the

¹ *Za rubezhom* No. 42, 1967, p. 10.

further deepening of socialist tendencies there are impossible unless there is a close alliance between national democracy and the masses of working people, unless the latter are given real opportunities to participate in the management of social and political life. Most timely for the countries with a socialist orientation at present is the following statement made by Lenin: "Capitalism cannot be vanquished without *taking over the banks*, without repealing *private ownership* of the means of production. These revolutionary measures, however, cannot be implemented without organising the entire people for democratic administration of the means of production captured from the bourgeoisie, without enlisting the entire mass of the working people, the proletarians, semi-proletarians and small peasants, for the democratic organisation of their ranks, their forces, their participation in state affairs."¹

The experience in non-capitalist development of the Soviet Central Asian republics has shown that the more extensively the Soviet organs of power relied on the working class, on the masses of working people, and the more stable their ties were with the people, the more successfully were the socio-economic transformations on the road to socialism implemented. The growing working class in Asia and Africa can have an even greater revolutionising effect on the socialist orientation. Addressing the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow, Leonid Brezhnev said: "There is no doubt that in the young national states ahead lies the broadest development of the working-class struggle against imperialism and its allies. It is the working-class movement that will ultimately play the decisive part in this area of the world too."²

The depth and scope of socio-economic changes depend on whether the working class of the newly independent countries can rally the peasantry to its side and on the strength of the alliance of these classes.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 25.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 153.

The strength of this alliance largely depends on the policy pursued by the national democrats in power and unity of action between the communist and revolutionary-democratic forces.

THE PEASANTRY AND SOCIALISM

In the countries with a socialist orientation, the peasantry makes up a large part of the gainfully employed population—from 65 to 80 per cent. This fact, coupled with the weakness of the working class in these countries, prompts even some progressive figures to maintain that these countries cannot build socialism.

This point of view, in fact, coincides with the conceptions of the European Social-Democrats, who feel that the peasantry is passive by nature and cannot wage a struggle for progress. Some petty-bourgeois ideologists take a diametrically opposite point of view. They say that the peasantry as a whole is a confirmed and consistent champion of socialism. Franz Fanon, for example, a well-known Algerian public figure and writer, declared the peasantry of the Third World countries to be the only revolutionary class, the only class capable of heading the revolution and leading all the other strata of society. As an argument, he cited the fact of the terrifying poverty of the basic mass of the peasantry in the newly independent countries. Rephrasing the slogan enunciated in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*—"The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win"—Fanon wrote in his book, *The Wretched of the Earth*, that in the colonial countries obviously only the peasants are revolutionary, since they have nothing to lose and everything to gain.¹

Similar views regarding the peasantry underlay the socialism of the Russian Narodniks. The latter were advocates of a petty-bourgeois, peasant socialism; they championed the ideas of a petty-bourgeois revolution, which they opposed to a proletarian revolution. Lenin criticised the views of the Narodniks, pointing out that

¹ F. Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, 1968, p. 61.

they ignored the dual social nature of the peasantry—the frequently manifested conflict of interests in the mind of the peasant who was a worker and at the same time a proprietor of the land he worked. This duality caused inconsistency in the behaviour of the peasant masses at definite stages of the revolutionary struggle. Lenin saw the alliance of the working class and the peasantry as the mighty motive force of a democratic—and of a socialist—revolution. Marxists believe that the peasantry has great revolutionary potential, but the indispensable condition for the complete victory of the socialist revolution is a stable alliance of the working class and the peasantry with the vanguard role played by the working class and its party. The truth of this proposition was confirmed by the Great October Socialist Revolution. The correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory with respect to the revolutionary transformation of the world was confirmed after that revolution by the transition to socialism of the peoples of the Soviet Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan, the socialist revolutions in the countries of Eastern Europe, and the development of national liberation movements into socialist revolutions in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

In many Asian and African countries, peasants live in conditions of a medieval and even pre-feudal natural economy. The peasantry is not only the largest, but also the most exploited section of the population, the victim of caste, tribal and other prejudices. However, here, too, an increasing class differentiation of the peasantry can be observed; in the process of socio-economic transformations, the peasantry is being revolutionised. As stressed at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "the toiling peasantry has great revolutionary potential". The vigorous actions taken by the Egyptian peasants together with the workers and all working people, in defence of their social gains and in support of Nasser's government during the Israeli aggression of 1967, showed that the peasantry can become an active force in non-capitalist development. The non-capitalist way of development gives the peasant incom-

parably greater benefits than capitalist development. The agrarian reforms that abolish feudal ownership and limit land ownership, the drawing of the peasant masses into the cooperative movement and into local organs of government, and the nationalisation of the credit and banking system, all meet the interests of the peasant masses and their desire to escape the clutches of poverty and backwardness. In other words, the peasants have a direct interest in the deep-going socio-economic transformations that are possible only in countries that have embarked on the non-capitalist road of development.

There is another factor that makes the peasants supporters of non-capitalist development. In a number of regions of Asia and Africa, agrarian overpopulation is intensifying. Great numbers of peasants, especially the youth, are streaming into the cities. Non-capitalist development, which ensures the growth of the state sector and the building of industrial enterprises, opens up the possibility for them to find work and take part in social production. It is not capitalism, but the socialist orientation that gives the peasant masses a chance to put an end to backwardness, oppression, superstition and poverty. At the same time, non-capitalist development does not infringe upon small commodity production or the property of the working peasants.

Those Social-Democrats in the West who do not see any big revolutionary potentialities in the peasantry, tend to identify its views only with the ideology of a proprietor. In his famous work, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", Lenin characterised the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry as follows: "Without ... becoming socialist, or ceasing to be petty-bourgeois, the peasantry is capable of becoming a wholehearted and most radical adherent of the democratic revolution. The peasantry will inevitably become such if only the course of revolutionary events, which brings it enlightenment, is not prematurely cut short by the treachery of the bourgeoisie and the defeat of the proletariat. Subject to this condition the peasantry will inevitably become a bulwark of the revolution and the republic, for only a completely victorious revolution

can give the peasantry *everything* in the sphere of agrarian reforms—*everything* that the peasants desire, dream of, and truly need (not for the abolition of capitalism as the 'Socialist-Revolutionaries' imagine, but) in order to emerge from the mire of semi-serfdom, from the gloom of oppression and servitude in order to improve their living conditions, as much as they can be improved within the system of commodity production."¹ This description of the Russian peasantry that Lenin gave in 1905 can, to a certain degree, be applied to the peasantry of Asia and Africa of the 1970s.

The consolidation and triumph of the socialist orientation largely depend on drawing the peasantry into the struggle. "The central question of the revolutionary process in Asia and Africa today is that of the attitude of the peasantry, which make up a majority of the population. The peasants in that part of the world are a mighty revolutionary force..." said Leonid Brezhnev.²

While recognising the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry, Marxists-Leninists are at the same time against the tendency to exaggerate them, against the contention that the peasantry is destined to play the decisive role in bringing about social transformations and carrying out the socialist revolution. As we know, the Chinese leaders absolutise this role, oppose the countryside to the city, and maintain that only the countryside is the "great military, political, economic and cultural bastion of the revolution".³ Moreover, they say that the countryside will arrive at communism sooner than the city and will lead the entire urban population after it.⁴

Lenin regarded the peasantry as the main ally of the proletariat, and he laid special emphasis on the need for the closest possible alliance of the working class and the peasantry in backward countries. He stressed that Communist parties would not be able to "pursue communist

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 98.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 153.

³ *Hung chi* No. 10, 1965.

⁴ *Jen-min jih-pao*, October 17, 1967.

tactics and a communist policy, without establishing definite relations with the peasant movement and without giving it effective support".¹ At the same time, Lenin never opposed the country to the town and did not consider the former to be the centre of the revolution, as Mao Tse-tung and his supporters do. Lenin repeatedly pointed to the political passiveness of the peasantry and the need to stimulate its revolutionary energy. In this regard, he wrote, "The town inevitably *leads* the country. The country inevitably *follows* the town."²

The experience of the Chinese revolution fails to confirm the Maoist assertions about the leading role of the peasantry at all stages of revolution. In the initial period of that revolution, the main events of the revolutionary struggle took place in the cities. It was only after Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary coup in 1927 that the focal point of Party work among the masses shifted to the countryside and the Communist Party of China began introducing revolutionary consciousness from the town to the country, actively drawing the peasants into the revolution. The work of the Chinese Communists in winning the peasant masses over to their side and strengthening ties with them confirms Lenin's propositions on the role of the peasantry as an ally of the proletariat.

The national liberation revolutions in Asia and Africa have awakened the peasantry, which constitutes a massive anti-imperialist and anti-feudal force. The main content of the peasant movement after the winning of political independence is struggle aimed at instituting agrarian transformations, establishing democratic freedoms and raising the material and cultural level of the peasants. This struggle assumes various forms. In the countries with a socialist orientation (Egypt, Algeria, Syria, Guinea and others), the peasantry takes an increasingly active part in creating the prerequisites for building socialism, i.e., in raising the level of agriculture and the economy as a whole. There is a widespread trend in these countries

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 241-42.

² V. I. Lenin, "Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 257.

towards the formation of primary cooperatives on a democratic basis, that is, the formation of cooperatives managed by the peasants themselves. An urgent task now facing the progressive forces in the countries with a socialist orientation is to draw the peasants to their side and turn them into resolute and dedicated fighters for the socialist orientation.

In "The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy", Lenin wrote: "...In order to facilitate for our farm labourers and semi-farm labourers the subsequent transition to socialism, it is highly important that the socialist party begin to 'stand up' at once for the small peasants, and do 'everything possible' for them, never refusing a hand in solving the urgent and complex 'alien' (non-proletarian) problems, and helping the working and exploited masses to regard the socialist party as their leader and representative."¹

In countries with a socialist orientation where the proletariat is still in the process of formation, where it is insufficiently organised and does not have enough political experience to stand at the head of the revolutionary struggle, the work of the revolutionary-democratic parties takes on special significance.

THE INTELLIGENTSIA, THE NATIONAL BOURGEOISIE AND OTHER SOCIAL STRATA

The national intelligentsia in the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa is small, but in recent years its ranks have grown markedly, because these countries are making every effort to create their own national cadres for the new and developing branches of social production. To this end, they are expanding the network of educational establishments. For example, the student population in Egypt grew from 53,000 in 1951 to 145,600 at the beginning of 1963.² Many students from Afro-Asian countries are receiving their higher and secondary education abroad.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 136.

² *Statistical Yearbook 1965*, New York, U.N., 1966, p. 713; *African Communist* No. 24, London, First Quarter, 1966, p. 78.

The exceedingly high illiteracy rate among the masses in the newly independent countries makes the role of the intelligentsia in politics and revolutionary transformations particularly great. In many of these countries, members of the intelligentsia occupy leading posts in the government, the ruling party and public organisations.

In its social make-up, the greater part of the intelligentsia in the newly independent countries consists of people from the well-to-do strata of the population. However, social origin does not in itself determine their political orientation. It is a well-known fact that both Marxists and reactionaries have come from the same social environment.

Characteristic of the intelligentsia as a whole in the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa is an anti-imperialist attitude. This stems primarily from the fact that the national intelligentsia had been subjected to various kinds of discrimination (racial, national, etc.) during the period of colonial rule. Key posts in the government apparatus of that period were held by representatives of the colonial administration from the parent countries who put the local intelligentsia in an unequal position. The national intelligentsia came to understand the importance of the role it was destined to play under the conditions of their countries' independent development and the intensified struggle in the international area between the two socio-economic systems. In fact, most of the revolutionary democrats who advocate consistent anti-imperialism and progressive social transformations came from among the commoners. Today's national democrats are members of the national intelligentsia who had experienced the full burden of colonial oppression and social exploitation, and who themselves came from the peasantry or other petty-bourgeois and semi-proletarian strata of town and country. They reflect the interests of broad social circles and play a leading role in the national front consisting of the petty-bourgeois strata of town and country, the workers and the peasants, as well as the anti-imperialist segment of the middle bourgeoisie. Thus, in terms of their social nature, the states with a socialist orientation may be classified as

a revolutionary dictatorship of the progressive middle petty-bourgeois strata who rely in the struggle against imperialism and reaction on the masses of working people. As concerns the various strata of the national bourgeoisie, they have to be approached differentially. Experience in non-capitalist development shows that a tendency towards conciliation with imperialism prevails in the upper strata of the national bourgeoisie, while the middle and especially the petty bourgeoisie are interested, at the first stage of non-capitalist development, in seeing general democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal measures carried out.

Lenin pointed out a fundamental difference between the bourgeoisie of the imperialist states and the national bourgeoisie of the Afro-Asian countries. The latter took shape as a class under conditions of the colonial dominance of imperialism, which had seized the commanding political and economic positions in those countries, and also under conditions of strong feudal and other pre-capitalist survivals that hampered the development of national capitalism. Hence the desire on the part of the local bourgeoisie for economic and political independence. This desire gives rise to a sharp and objective contradiction between the national bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and imperialism and feudalism, on the other. At the same time, the local bourgeoisie tends to split into two groups: the pro-imperialist and the national. The pro-imperialist part of the local bourgeoisie, which enters into alliance with imperialism for the purpose of exploiting the people of their country, becomes a counter-revolutionary, anti-national force that not only fights against a socialist orientation, but opposes any form of limitation on foreign capital in the country. The section of the national bourgeoisie that wants to see the development of national capitalism, however, supports the general democratic and anti-imperialist measures of the first stage, inasmuch as such measures can protect it from economic pressure by the imperialist monopolies and competition from big foreign and local capital. This accounts for the revolutionary potential of certain strata of the national bourgeoisie and their ability to take part in solving urgent

national tasks at the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution.

Characterising the role of the national bourgeoisie in the liberation movement and defining the Marxist position with respect to this bourgeoisie, Lenin wrote that "everywhere in Asia a mighty democratic movement is growing, spreading and gaining in strength. The bourgeoisie there is *as yet* siding with the people against reaction",¹ that "in Asia there is *still* a bourgeoisie capable of championing sincere, militant, consistent democracy".² Further, Lenin said: "*Insofar as* the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation fights the oppressor, we are always, in every case, and more strongly than anyone else, *in favour*, for we are the staunchest and the most consistent enemies of oppression."³ "Socialists," Lenin stressed, "must also render determined support to the more revolutionary elements in the bourgeois-democratic movements for national liberation in these countries and assist their uprising—or revolutionary war, in the event of one—*against* the imperialist powers that oppress them."⁴

The national-democratic revolutions that are now bringing the peoples of Asia and Africa out onto the non-capitalist road of development have social features that are new, compared with the revolutions in which the leading force was the national bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeois strata and all strata of working people play a fundamentally different and more active social role in them. The progressive transformations that these revolutions give rise to are of a much broader democratic character, and the prospects for social development that they open up have a fundamentally different and much more radical content.

An active role in the developing countries is played by

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Backward Europe and Advanced Asia", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 99-100.

² V. I. Lenin, "Democracy and Narodism in China", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 165.

³ V. I. Lenin, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 411-12.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 151-52.

the army. As the experience of non-capitalist development confirms, the army in Egypt, Algeria, Burma, Syria, Iraq and other countries, can become an important progressive factor in the political struggle aimed at deepening the national-democratic revolution. General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Syria Khaled Bagdash writes: "Of the middle strata, the officers in control of the army are the only organised and armed force. It is not surprising, therefore, that they played the principal and most active role."¹

It should be kept in mind, however, that a military coup carried out by the army in a developing country can be either progressive or reactionary, depending on the internal political situation and the correlation of various foreign and internal social forces. In Egypt, Burma, and Syria, for example, the progressive part of the military formed a bloc with the peasantry and other petty-bourgeois strata in support of radical transformations, while the military coups in Brazil, Zaire, Indonesia, and Ghana were directed against the democratic forces.

Soviet scholar G. I. Mirsky names the following factors as tending to promote a military coup:

"—the existence of broad dissatisfaction, basically nationalistic in character, with the pro-imperialist policy of the ruling clique (as a rule, also connected with its unwillingness to carry out urgent social reforms), and the absence of a strong and organised civilian opposition to the regime. This was the main factor in Egypt and Iraq;

"—a chronic internal political crisis resulting from the inability of the civilian government to solve urgent internal problems and lead the country out of an impasse (Burma);

"—dissatisfaction of the educated elite with the rigidity and archaic nature of a despotic regime;

"—a generally ineffective civilian government coupled with corruption in the administration and apathy and disenchantment among the masses..."²

¹ Khaled Bagdash, "Some Problems of National Liberation Movement" in: *World Marxist Review*, 1964, Vol. 7, No. 8, p. 52.

² *Classes and Class Struggle in the Developing Countries*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1967, p. 341 (in Russian).

In analysing the motive forces operating in a country with a socialist orientation it is also necessary to take into account the influence of certain factors in the internal and international situation in which the country proceeds along the non-capitalist road. Many factors promote the emergence of anti-capitalist attitudes and the spread of the socialist ideology within one or another social group or stratum.

The national liberation struggle, directed against imperialism and one of its most monstrous manifestations, colonialism, awakened broad strata of the people of former colonies and semi-colonies to political activity. As a result, the peasant masses, members of the intelligentsia and other strata of the population began to take a direct part in the struggle against capitalism and imperialism.

Now that they have won political independence, however, the peoples of the developing countries are constantly faced with one or another manifestation of neo-colonialism, with its attempts to preserve the economic dependence of the newly independent countries and their unequal and subordinated position in the world capitalist market, with continued robbery and exploitation by means of various forms of export of capital and nonequivalent exchange. All this gives rise to increasingly widespread anti-imperialist attitudes in these countries.

Under the impact of these factors, and under the impact of the economic and political efforts in the developing countries, broad strata of the peasantry, the petty urban bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and other working strata of the population are taking anti-capitalist positions.

For successful development along the non-capitalist road it is very important that the popular masses retain their revolutionary enthusiasm, and this is assured if they take an active part in the implementation of economic, social and cultural changes. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on the historical and crucial role of the masses is fully applicable to Afro-Asian countries with a socialist orientation.

In an attempt to refute this teaching, the enemies of the socialist orientation cite Ghana, where the masses turned out to be indifferent to the counter-revolutionary

coup in February 1966. However, they do not reveal the causes of this indifference, which stemmed above all from the errors of the former leadership of the Convention People's Party. The masses were misled by the Party's assertions that there were no class contradictions in the country, that the economic and political interests of all social strata and classes in Ghana were in harmony. Actually, Ghana had no class party that could lead the masses along the non-capitalist road of development. A correct and clear-cut policy of struggle for the cause of socialism always gets vigorous support from the masses.

In Mali in June 1967, Rightist elements opposed to non-capitalist development began the secret distribution of leaflets attacking the Left wing of the Party and Government leadership. In response to this reactionary sortie were massive demonstrations by youth, trade unions and the army, confirming the loyalty of the masses to a policy aimed at gradually laying the foundations of a socialist society. However, when Modibo Keita carried out certain undemocratic measures (dissolving the political bureau of the Union Soudanaise party, etc.), he began to lose the support of the masses.

Many classes and social strata of contemporary society in Asia and Africa—workers, peasants, the petty urban bourgeoisie, the progressive intelligentsia and others—are deeply interested in non-capitalist development. In the process of the class struggle they can gain considerable advantage over the pro-imperialist reactionary forces and ensure the realisation of profound socio-economic changes aimed at creating the material and political prerequisites for the transition to a socialist revolution.

NATIONAL DEMOCRACY AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

Can national democratic forces follow through on non-capitalist development and create the conditions necessary for a transition to the building of a socialist society? The experience of Mongolia says yes. In a talk with a Mongolian delegation in 1921, Lenin noted that the main thing that would ensure the transition to non-capitalist development was intensified work on the part

of the People's Revolutionary Party and Government in bringing about the growth of cooperatives, introducing new forms of management and national culture, and rallying the arats around the Party and the Government. It was only out of small islands of a new economic structure, created under the influence of the Party and the Government, that the new non-capitalist economic system took shape in predominantly cattle-raising Mongolia. To the Mongolian delegation's question, "Should not the People's Revolutionary Party be turned into a Communist Party?" Lenin replied that a Communist Party is a party of the proletariat and therefore "the revolutionaries will have to put in a good deal of work in developing state, economic and cultural activities before the herdsman elements become a proletarian mass, which may eventually help to 'transform' the People's Revolutionary Party into a Communist Party. A mere change in signboards is harmful and dangerous."¹

These ideas of Lenin's and the experience accumulated by Mongolia are extremely important for Afro-Asian countries with a socialist orientation, especially for those that are beginning at approximately the same level of socio-economic development as Mongolia did. This experience tells us that the transition of economically backward countries to the non-capitalist road of development begins under the leadership of revolutionary democratic parties whose members remain loyal to the interests of the masses.

At the present time, revolutionary democratic parties are very heterogeneous in composition. G. B. Starushenko, a Soviet student of this question, notes that while they include leading statesmen, high government officials, members of the intelligentsia and military officers, their basic membership is made up of representatives of the urban petty-bourgeois strata, peasants, workers, and a substantial part of the student population.

He points out that these parties are not made up wholly of staunch supporters of a socialist orientation. They

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Draft Decision for the Politbureau", *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 361.

frequently have members who are hostile to the ideas of socialism and are out-and-out foes of progressive changes.

Imperialism has launched a broad campaign of ideological subversion against the newly independent countries with a socialist orientation. Speculating on the fact that the socialist ideas held by national democrats often have strong nationalistic overtones, and also the fact that the majority of the population of Asia and Africa embrace Islam and other religions, the ideologists of imperialism try in every way possible to oppose these ideas and beliefs to scientific socialism. They also spread slanderous fabrications to the effect that Marxists-Leninists are enemies of any kind of nationalism and any and all private property.

The bourgeois propaganda machine and reactionary writers have conceived many slanderous myths about Communists and the Marxist-Leninist teaching, including the myth of the "communist menace", so long and persistently spread by imperialist propaganda. This myth portrays Communists as "conspirators" against the legal governments of the countries of Asia and Africa, as "agents" engaged in the export of communism to these countries.

It should be noted that from the very beginning of the communist movement, the enemies of peace and progress have waged a relentless battle against its bright ideals of struggle against oppression, slavery and the exploitation of man by man. When, as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet state of workers and peasants was born, anti-communism added the component of anti-Sovietism—the frantic struggle of imperialists and all reactionaries against the Soviet Union, its home and foreign policy and its socialist system. Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism are the poisoned weapon with which the imperialists strive to undermine the alliance of the revolutionary-democratic forces of the developing countries, world socialism, and the international communist and workers' movement, an alliance that guarantees the successful development of the newly independent countries towards socialism. Let us examine

some specific examples of the ideological subversion carried out by imperialism against national democracy and scientific socialism and the real attitude of Marxists-Leninists on the subjects chosen for this subversion.

A) THE ATTITUDE OF MARXISTS-LENINISTS TOWARDS NATIONALISM

In the preceding section we emphasised that Lenin made a fundamental distinction between the nationalism of a dominating nation and the nationalism of an oppressed nation. For many decades, imperialists and their propaganda machine pronounced an anathema on the nationalism of Asians and Africans—the nationalism of oppressed nations. They even maintained that this nationalism "was born of communism". Now, however, imperialist propaganda says something quite different; it accuses scientific socialism of being an enemy of any kind of nationalism. American experts on ideological strategy R. Strausz-Hupé and T. Possony openly recommended to their propagandists to emphasise in the psychological offensive the conflict between communism and nationalism.¹ The ideologists of imperialism claim that Marxism-Leninism is an irreconcilable enemy of any nationalism in the newly independent countries. How is this switch in imperialist propaganda explained?

Lenin always spoke against stating the question of nationalism abstractly; he taught revolutionaries to approach it concretely. Underlying the nationalism of a dominating nation (such as the English nation was, for example, which subjected many peoples to its colonial domination) is the desire to seize and enslave other states. However, even within such a nation there exists a counter-tendency which to a certain degree paralyses the chauvinist and expansionist efforts of the big monopoly bourgeoisie. It is well known that the British Communists and other progressive forces have opposed and continue to oppose the imperialist policy of Great Britain.

¹ R. Strausz-Hupé, Stefan T. Possony, *International Relations in the Age of the Conflict Between Democracy and Dictatorship*, New York, 1954.

The nationalism of a nation oppressed by imperialism (for example, the nationalism of the nations that have now freed themselves from colonialism), as Lenin pointed out, has two sides: a progressive side, directed towards the liberation of the people from foreign and any kind of national oppression, and a reactionary side, expressing the aspirations of the national bourgeoisie to dominate its own and other peoples.

Pointing out this contradictoriness, Lenin taught Communists to be cautious in their attitude towards the nationalism of the peoples of the East. He wrote: "You will have to base yourselves on the bourgeois nationalism which is awakening, and must awaken, among those peoples, and which has its historical justification."¹ What historical justification for nationalism did Lenin see?

Colonial domination with its plunder and violence, racial discrimination and scorn for the culture of the peoples of the East inevitably gave rise to the growth of nationalism. It was a natural reaction to colonial expansion, and it united different classes and social groups of the oppressed peoples for a common struggle for national independence. At that stage of the anti-imperialist struggle, nationalism expressed the interests of the peoples. For example, an Arab Congress held in Jerusalem in 1931 proclaimed the unity of the Arab nation, refused to recognise the division forced upon it, and emphasised the resolve of all Arabs to fight colonialism until complete liberation was achieved.

Lenin was the first Marxist to see the anti-imperialist direction taken by the nationalism of oppressed nations. Anti-imperialist nationalism played an important role in helping Afro-Asian countries to gain political independence. The anti-imperialist content of nationalism in those countries is still an important factor today.

But in examining the nature of nationalism, sight should not be lost of Lenin's observation that "nationalism

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

goes through various phases" in its development. At the second stage—the stage of the struggle of the peoples of Asia and Africa to consolidate their political and establish their economic independence—the balance of class forces within the national liberation movement and the character of their tasks change. The reactionary segment of the national bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes feels that the revolution has ended and the time has come to get rich by exploiting the masses. Under these conditions, it is the reactionary side of the nationalism of a recently oppressed nation that comes increasingly to the fore. It shows itself in the refusal of the exploiting classes—the national, bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the feudal lords—to carry out far-reaching socio-economic changes and their sabotage of these changes, as was the case in Egypt, Algeria and other newly independent countries. Revealing the social nature and class limitations of nationalism as the ideology of the exploiting classes, Lenin cautioned the international working class not to allow its support of the national liberation movement to turn into "an apologia of nationalism, it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements, in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness".¹

Of particular significance at the stage of radical socio-economic transformations is Lenin's proposition concerning the instability and inconsistency of the petty bourgeoisie. The correctness of this proposition is borne out by the situation in Arab and African countries with a socialist orientation. In the course of intensified class struggle in the ARE, Syria, Algeria and other countries, part of the petty bourgeoisie, swayed by influential strata of the national bourgeoisie and imperialist propaganda speculating on the objective difficulties of national construction, becomes more and more conservative, breaks with the socialist orientation, and begins to resist further progressive changes. This should be reckoned with as a reality of the present stage of the struggle for socialist construc-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 34.

tion. It calls for serious efforts to strengthen the front of all Left and anti-imperialist forces.

Aggravation of the class struggle leads to a split of the anti-colonial front that had been formed during the period in which political independence was won. It convinces increasing numbers of ideologists and leaders of the national liberation movement of the urgency of advancing full-scale social liberation programmes and relying heavily on the masses for their implementation. At the same time, the bourgeois exploiter elements step up their efforts to promote conservative, reactionary tendencies in nationalism. These elements are ready to sacrifice the national interests to their own narrow class interests.

This reactionary nationalism is exactly what imperialism banks on as it gives all-out support to chauvinistically inclined nationalists. The kindling by imperialism and reaction of separatist and chauvinistic tendencies in nationalism leads to serious political consequences and damages the cause of progress in the newly independent countries. In countries that have proclaimed their ultimate goal to be the building of a socialist society, reactionary nationalism supported by imperialism only impedes the solution of urgent socio-economic problems, plays into the hands of the imperialists and has no historical justification whatever.

Marxists-Leninists are genuine internationalists; they vigorously oppose the domination of one nation by another and any kind of national oppression. At the same time they realise that the nationalism and nationalistic prejudices that still exist among various strata of the population in Asia and Africa are above all the result of prolonged colonial dominance by the imperialists, who callously violated the honour and national dignity of the Asian and African peoples. But nationalistic prejudices are not the main obstacle to the further development of the Afro-Asian peoples' struggle for progress and socialism. As the struggle against imperialism continues and as political consciousness grows, national egoism and the prejudices of bourgeois nationalism gradually become weaker and weaker among revolutionary democrats, who

are increasingly influenced by the ideas of scientific socialism. Lenin taught Communists not to push away from the revolutionary struggle any forces that gravitate towards socialism. He urged forming an alliance with those of them that turn towards the proletariat. Such is the actual attitude of scientific socialism to nationalism in the countries of Asia and Africa. It is radically different from what imperialist propaganda is trying to make the Asian and African peoples believe it is.

B) THE ATTITUDE OF MARXISTS-LENINISTS TO RELIGION

When there were no Communists in the world as yet, the European colonialists waged a merciless war against the Moslems. By cajolery and bribery, by blackmail and deceit, by fire and sword they spread the Christian religion in the enslaved countries of Asia and Africa, executing Christ's so-called "missionary command": "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It is enough to recall the bloody crusades, when a predatory, plundering policy was pursued under the pretext of "defending the Christian holy places from the Moslems".

The history of the 16th to the second half of the 19th century gives many examples of how the missionary priest went side by side with the soldier-conquerer and the merchant-slave trader, and often combined the one and the other in the same person. The antagonism between the colonised and the colonialists also took on the form of religious antagonism. European and American colonialists were violent enemies and oppressors of all non-Christian religions and beliefs—Islam, Buddhism, Confucianism and others.

In the era of imperialism and socialist revolutions, the colonialists and neo-colonialists began to use for their selfish aims the very enmity between Christians and Moslems they had kindled. In Guinea, Zaire, Uganda, southern Sudan and wherever else possible, imperialism exploited religious sentiments in the pursuit of goals inimical to the peoples. Then, as the urgency of the

struggle against the national liberation movement and socialism grew, the imperialists began feverishly "to build bridges" between Christianity and Islam. They began to propagate the idea of their spiritual unity with Moslems and Buddhists in the struggle against "godless communism". The imperialists now tell the Moslems: "You believe in God, and we believe in God. Religion can unite us in the struggle against the Communists." Imperialist propaganda has even labelled as "godless" a number of outstanding figures in the national liberation movement who actually embrace Islam. Malicious slander against Communists permeates bourgeois ideologist Walter Kolarz's book, *Religion and Communism in Africa*, in which he accuses Communists of nurturing feelings of hatred towards religion and states that they pose a "threat to Islam".¹ The imperialists use the religious question to kindle anti-communism and anti-Sovietism and thus undermine the cause of the Afro-Asian peoples' social emancipation.

It is common knowledge that the church still plays an important role in the life of the peoples of Asia and Africa. In more than 30 Asian and African countries, Islam is the prevailing religion. According to *The Islamic Review*, there are some 560,000,000 Moslems in the world today.² What attitude does scientific socialism take with respect to religion, including Islam? Can people's attitudes towards religion be an insurmountable obstacle to the unification of all progressive revolutionary forces working for social progress? Do Communists threaten the views and feelings of believers, as the imperialists claim they do?

Communists have never concealed the fact that they are guided in their theoretical and practical activity by the materialist scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism, nor do they conceal their atheistic views.

But this does not in the least imply that adherence to scientific socialism requires of Communists and all progressives fighting for the progress and happiness of peoples that they declare war on religion. Engels strongly con-

¹ W. Kolarz, *Religion and Communism in Africa*, Indiana, 1962.

² *The Islamic Review*, November-December 1965, p. 30.

demned the Blanquist émigrés for their attempts to declare war on religion.¹ When in 1877, the "Left" revolutionary Dühring called for a ban on religion in socialist society, Engels voiced strong opposition to this viewpoint.

Lenin stressed that "the Social-Democrats are fighting for complete freedom of conscience, and have every respect for any sincere conviction in matters of faith, provided that conviction is not implemented by force or deception".² He said that Communists should not "prohibit proletarians who still retain vestiges of their old prejudices from associating themselves with our Party. We shall always preach the scientific world-outlook ... but that does not mean in the least that the religious question ought to be advanced to first place..."³

The Communists' view is that the basic ideological and political barrier passes not between believers and non-believers, but between exploiters and exploited. Communists are for sincere cooperation with all revolutionary democrats, regardless of their religious convictions, who struggle in the interests of the masses and cherish the ideals of national renaissance and social progress. And they do not make such cooperation contingent upon anyone's repudiation of his religious convictions. Consequently, different attitudes towards religion cannot be a bone of contention between Communists and revolutionary democrats, between genuine revolutionaries. Lenin drew this conclusion in his famous articles, "Socialism and Religion" and "The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion", written in 1905 and 1909 respectively. These articles have not lost their relevance to relations between Communists and revolutionary democrats to this day.

Imperialist propaganda slanders the Communists when it asserts that they want to eradicate Islam. Communists display the utmost tolerance for the feelings of devout

¹ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, pp. 380-86.

² V. I. Lenin, "Draft for a Speech on the Agrarian Question in the Second State Duma", *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 296.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and Religion", *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 87.

Moslems. As early as December 3, 1917, the Soviet Government addressed a special appeal "To All the Working Moslems of Russia and the East", in which the colonialist policy of tsarism and international imperialism was strongly condemned. Unconditionally taking sides with the Moslem working people, "whose mosques and praying places", as the appeal stressed, "had been subject to destruction and whose beliefs and customs had been violated", the Soviet Government solemnly declared: "Henceforth your faith and customs and your national and cultural institutions are declared free and inviolable."¹ Just how sensitive the leader of the socialist revolution, Vladimir Lenin, was to the feelings of devout Moslems can be seen from the following fact. In December 1917, a letter came to the Council of People's Commissars from the Territorial Moslem Congress of the Petrograd National Area, in which "on behalf of all Russian Moslems" a request was made to turn over to them the Holy Koran of Osman, which was then in the possession of the State Public Library. In a letter to the People's Commissar of Education, A. V. Lunacharsky, Lenin asked that the request be satisfied immediately.²

The facts of history completely refute the fabrications of the imperialists and reactionaries to the effect that Communists have a feeling of hatred for religion. It is well known that after the October Revolution, the Soviet Government urged the clergy of all churches and religious organisations to go over to positions of loyalty to the new system, and on its part did everything to facilitate such a transition. The Communist Party took a differential approach even to members of the class of the ulema—Moslem religious leaders who controlled all the religious, legal and educational institutions, as well as extensive land and money holdings. Thus, for example, in September 1920, the Fifth Congress of the Communist Party of Turkestan noted that "there is a progressive

¹ *Decrees of Soviet Power*, Moscow, 1957, pp. 113-14 (in Russian).

² *V. I. Lenin on Central Asia and Kazakhstan*, Gosizdat, Uzbek SSR, 1960, p. 364 (in Russian).

section within the ulema" and "acknowledged the possibility of its use in Soviet institutions".¹

In May 1922, a plenary session of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee of Soviets adopted a decision to return the waqfs—land that belonged to the mosques and madrasahs and rented out to peasants—to their former owners. Also, out of respect for the feelings of the devout, it permitted the *kazis* and *bis* to perform their religious functions. The decision stated that Soviet power was concerned exclusively with the economic rebirth of the republic and that "this power in the East does not set itself the task of fighting Islam, the shariat or local customs".

The genuine democracy of a socialist society guarantees to everyone in it freedom of conscience and freedom of religion. The citizen of a socialist state can believe or not believe in God, recognise or not recognise religion. Moreover, these freedoms are not merely proclaimed; they are ensured by force of law, as in Articles 124 and 135 of the Constitution of the USSR. In socialist countries, for example, it is forbidden to use the feelings of believers for selfish purposes, for profit, etc., while in the capitalist countries, religion is often used to further the selfish interests of the ruling classes, to the detriment of the interests of the bulk of working people.

The enemies of the Arab peoples try to place the actual freedom of conscience in the USSR in doubt. They frequently resort to outright slander, asserting that the religious feelings of people are suppressed in the Soviet Union. But here is what we find in a report by Colin Simpson, a writer well known in the West, who paid a visit to Babakhanov, mufti of Central Asia, with the aim of acquainting himself with the life of the peoples of the Soviet republics of Central Asia.

Simpson asked Babakhanov whether he was satisfied with the degree of religious freedom that Moslems have in Central Asia. Babakhanov replied that he was completely satisfied: there are no obstacles to the performance

¹ *Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses of the Communist Party of Turkestan, 1918-1924*, Tashkent, 1968 (in Russian).

of religious rites; the mosques are open in all cities; his students can go abroad to study, for example to Egypt and other countries of the Moslem world; and every year several pilgrims set out for Mecca and Medina.

To Simpson's question as to whether Babakhanov approved of the emancipation of women under communism, the latter replied that one of his daughters was a doctor and another was studying Eastern languages at Tashkent University. Incidentally, by decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, mufti Babakhanov was awarded the Order of the Badge of Honour in January 1968, in recognition of his great patriotic work in defence of peace and on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday.

Communists stand for sincere cooperation with all progressive people to whom the interests of the masses are dear. And they do not demand of believers, including those professing Islam, any rejection of their religious convictions as a condition for such cooperation. Consequently, the religious question cannot be an obstacle to strengthening the anti-imperialist alliance between Communists and revolutionary democrats.

The main enemy of socialism and the national liberation movement is imperialism, which endeavours by every means possible, including open aggression, to frustrate the implementation of profound socio-economic changes in the Arab and other newly independent countries. To achieve their ends, imperialism and Zionism launched a war of aggression against the progressive regime in the Arab world. Struggle against imperialism, struggle to preserve and strengthen peace, struggle for the complete elimination of colonialism, struggle against imperialist military bases—such is the common action programme of the Communists and the revolutionary-democratic forces. In the face of the aggressive actions of imperialism, differences of opinion between the Communist Parties and the revolutionary-democratic parties on ideological, including religious, questions must not be allowed to impede the strengthening of cooperation and unity. The popular masses understand this. For example, in some European countries there is a notable increase in cooperation and joint action between Com-

munists and broad sections of democratic Catholics and people professing other religions. The dialogue between them on such problems as war and peace, capitalism and socialism, neo-colonialism and the developing countries has assumed great importance in our day. As stressed at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "Communists are convinced that in this way—through broad contacts and joint action—the mass of religious people can become an active force in the anti-imperialist struggle and in carrying out far-reaching social changes."¹ This was also borne out by the experience in non-capitalist development in People's Mongolia, where the solution of the lamaist question was a most difficult task during the anti-feudal stage of the revolution (1921-40).

Taking into account the religiousness of the population of Mongolia and striving to strengthen the national front, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party considered it imperative temporarily to preserve the constitutional monarchy headed by the bogdo-gegen, the highest person in lamaism, limiting his power, however, in secular matters. At the same time, as Y. Tsedenbal has stressed, the MPRP adopted "a policy aimed at the class stratification of the lamas, isolating the feudal upper clique of the religious community from the broad masses of the lower and middle lamas. Intensive political and educational work was done among the rank-and-file lamas". Striving in every way possible to encourage the lamas to go over to secular life, the state gave such lamas material support in starting up their households, organising production artels of handicraftsmen, etc. As a result, many lamas voluntarily left their order, married and raised families, and began to engage in socially useful labour.²

Needless to say, both in Mongolia and in the Central Asian republics of the Soviet East, the new power clamped down on the counter-revolutionary political activity of reactionary religious groups. The revolutionary democratic

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 27.

² See: Y. Tsedenbal, *From Feudalism to Socialism. Selected Articles and Speeches*, Moscow, 1962, pp. 282, 285-86 (in Russian).

parties of a number of countries with a socialist orientation are currently pursuing a similar policy. In Egypt, for example, the reactionary religious organisation, the Moslem Brothers, has been outlawed. Nasser sharply condemned this organisation, which, in his words, pursued criminal aims, was closely tied in with British imperialism, defended the interests of the reactionary circles, and had nothing in common with the people.¹

Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma Ne Vin, in a statement concerning the reactionary, anti-popular activity of a certain part of the Buddhist monks ("pseudo-monks", as he called them), made it clear that they were the stooges of politicians who carried on their iniquitous business under the protection of religion and playing on the religious feelings of the people. Politicians and economic insurgents found in these pseudo-monks easy stooges who could be potential saboteurs.² A special document, "The Policy and Views of the Revolutionary Council on the Religious Question", dated April 18, 1964, stressed that monks should concentrate on the purification and development of Buddhism and not engage in politics, which is an exclusively secular affair; that the Revolutionary Council would not tolerate any person or organisation engaging in politics under the protection of religion.³ Thus, their own adherence to a faith does not keep revolutionary democrats from stopping the anti-popular activity of clerical circles that ally themselves with imperialism and neo-colonialism and fight against progressive socio-economic changes.

C) THE ATTITUDE OF MARXISTS-LENINISTS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY

As mentioned earlier, far-reaching socio-economic changes are taking place in the countries of Asia and Africa with a socialist orientation. In the course of these changes the big property holdings of the foreign and local bourgeoisie are nationalised, thus weakening the neo-colo-

¹ *Pravda*, December 24, 1965.

² *Forward*, Vol. 3, No. 49, Rangoon, May 15, 1968, pp. 43, 44.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

nialist positions of imperialism and helping the newly independent countries attain economic independence. This is why the imperialists have been industriously spreading fabrications to the effect that under socialism, which is what the countries developing along non-capitalist lines want ultimately to build, all private property, the right to possess which is proclaimed by Islam, will be abolished. These fabrications are spread with an eye to those revolutionary democrats in Asia and Africa who are trying to reconcile the existence of private ownership of the means of production with their declared principles of socialism. They are designed also to frighten numerically large sections of the petty bourgeoisie away from the socialist orientation. What in fact is the attitude of Marxists to property ownership?

One of the basic principles and absolute demands of scientific socialism, which has been fully translated into reality in the Soviet Union, is the elimination of the exploitation of man by man, the abolishment of private ownership of the basic instruments and means of production, and the socialisation of this property, which is the basis of capitalist production and the foundation of the exploitation of working people.

Scientific socialism is for the elimination of private property that serves as an instrument for exploiting the working class and all working people and is used for the purpose of enriching small groups of big capitalists and feudal lords. This includes factories, banks, land, transport and other kinds of property. However, it is common knowledge that peasants in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have at their personal disposal individual plots of land, houses, livestock, certain implements of production, etc.

Only a poor knowledge of the theory of scientific socialism could account for the statements made by some revolutionary democrats that Communists in all cases demand the confiscation of any and all private property and that they are in all cases against paying compensation. In this connection, Lenin pointed out that "...Marx was profoundly right when he taught the workers the importance of preserving the organisation of large-scale produc-

tion, precisely for the purpose of facilitating the transition to socialism. Marx taught that (as an exception, and Britain was then an exception) the idea was conceivable of *paying the capitalists well*, of buying them out, if the circumstances were such as to compel the capitalists to submit peacefully and to come over to socialism in a cultured and organised fashion, provided they were paid well".¹

In its time, the young Soviet Republic offered to buy out the overthrown exploiting classes and international imperialism if only they did not interfere with its building of socialism. In a speech at the Seventh Moscow Gubernia Conference of the Russian Communist Party in 1921, Lenin said that the sense of many of the first decrees of Soviet power (for example, the decree on the state monopoly of advertisements and the decrees concerning the banking business) was such that it contemplated the preservation of a large number of private establishments and of certain private ownership procedures. But the capitalist world rejected any compromise whatever. Lenin described the situation as follows: "We, who had said to the capitalists, 'Submit to state regulation, submit to state power, and instead of the complete abolition of the conditions that correspond to the old interests, habits and views of the population, changes will be gradually made by state regulation'—we found our very existence in jeopardy. The capitalist class had adopted the tactics of forcing us into a desperate and relentless struggle, and that compelled us to destroy the old relations to a far larger extent than we had at first intended."²

The former exploiting classes were themselves to blame for not wanting to receive definite compensation for property taken over by the victorious people. They hoped that with the help of international imperialism they could re-establish the old system by force of arms and get back all their riches. As a result, they were left with nothing. Assertions made by the ideologists of impe-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tax in Kind", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 338-39.

² V. I. Lenin, "Seventh Moscow Gubernia Conference of the Russian Communist Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 90-91,

rialism that socialism demands the elimination of all private property and confiscation without compensation are false. Some reactionaries try to use the Koran for the same purpose. But when some Arab circles expressed the fear that certain revolutionary reforms in the ARE were in contradiction to the religion of Islam, Sheikh Hassan Mamoun, the Rector of the ancient Moslem al-Azhar University in Cairo, citing the Koran, stated that Islamic Law respects private property as long as it does not conflict with the public interest. Hassan Mamoun has also pointed out that laws passed in Egypt, including the agrarian reform, are in accord with Islamic Law.¹

As can be seen from the practice of many countries, the non-capitalist way of development towards socialism presumes the development of the state sector. By developing this sector and by establishing strict control over private enterprise and placing it within definite limits, revolutionary governments deprive capitalism of any long-range prospects, and at the same time create the material prerequisites for the subsequent transition of their countries to the building of a socialist society. This is a realistic and far-sighted policy.

D) ATTITUDE OF MARXISTS-LENINISTS TOWARDS FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The enemies of Marxism-Leninism persistently spread the slanderous myth that socialist countries are totalitarian, the myth that the freedom of the individual is suppressed in these countries. This kind of villifying propaganda is designed to disorient the popular masses in the newly independent countries and to frighten them away from socialism. The imperialists also try to persuade the revolutionary democrats of these countries that the principles of individual freedom are incompatible with the principles of scientific socialism, which calls for the dictatorship of the proletariat, a form of power that "rejects any kind of democracy". In this connection, impe-

¹ *The Islamic Review*, November-December 1965, Vol. 53, No. 11-12, pp. 23, 25.

rialist propaganda denigrates socialist democracy and grossly distorts the Leninist content of the dictatorship of the proletariat by alleging that it "violates the will of the people".

Lenin himself exposed the absurdity of the view that Marxism declares the individual "*quantité négligeable*".¹ He pointed out that the goal of socialism is to ensure "full well-being and free, all-round development for all its members".²

The dictatorship of the proletariat was necessary to attain this goal and to break the resistance of the deposed exploiting classes. "History teaches us," wrote Lenin, "that no oppressed class ever did, or could, achieve power without going through a period of dictatorship, i.e., the conquest of political power and forcible suppression of the resistance always offered by the exploiters—a resistance that is most desperate, most furious, and that stops at nothing."³

With the aim of building a socialist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian state, performs a great variety of functions—economic, cultural, educational, organisational, national defence, and many others. But its main function, on which all the others depend, is to suppress the resistance of the deposed exploiter classes. Lenin put it this way: "The proletariat needs state power, a centralised organisation of force, an organisation of violence, both to crush the resistance of the exploiters and to *lead* the enormous mass of the population—the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, and semi-proletarians—in the work of organising a socialist economy."⁴

As the experience of the ARE, Syria, Burma, Guinea and other countries with a socialist orientation shows, the system established in these countries is a dictatorship

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 318.

² V. I. Lenin, "Draft Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 28.

³ V. I. Lenin, "First Congress of Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 458.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 404.

of revolutionary democracy. It rests on the support of the non-proletarian and semi-proletarian masses, above all on the peasantry, the middle strata and the intelligentsia.

The revolutionary democrats of these countries have begun the work of breaking the resistance of the exploiting classes—the capitalists and landowners—and of providing state leadership to the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry. The fact that this dictatorship may enter into a coalition with patriotic sections of the petty bourgeoisie and part of the middle bourgeoisie does not detract from its anti-exploitative, anti-capitalist direction. A revolutionary-democratic dictatorship, which in the countries with a socialist orientation represents the interests of the exploited majority of the population, is not the antipode of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but its ally.

The more than half-century of experience in socialist and communist construction in the Soviet Union has fully justified itself. The principles of genuine democracy and freedom—democracy and freedom for the working people and not just for a small group of rich people and feudal lords—have been translated into reality.

This freedom is ensured by the dictatorship of the proletariat, which expresses the interests of the working class and all working people.

The dictatorship of the proletariat has ensured for the working class, the peasantry and all working people the right to work, to education, to rest, to active participation in the political and social life of the country—rights without which there can be no real freedom of the individual. In 1918, in his "Letter to American Workers" Lenin pointed out that the ideas of scientific socialism, the ideals of peace, a just social system, freedom and democracy were winning the minds of millions of people and that imperialism had nothing to offer to match them. "The workers of the whole world, no matter in what country they live, greet us, sympathise with us, applaud us for breaking the iron ring of imperialist ties, of sordid imperialist treaties, of imperialist chains—for ... raising the banner of peace, the banner of socialism for the whole world to see.

"Small wonder that the international imperialist gang hates us for this..."¹

The imperialists and reactionaries use lies and slander to hit back at all consistent fighters for freedom, democracy and socialism, to split their ranks, to paralyse the working people's will to wage a liberation struggle. This was the conclusion Lenin drew in his "Letter to American Workers", showing the reactionary essence of American imperialism. And this conclusion was confirmed and is being confirmed by history.

It was under the pretext of struggle against the "communist danger" that the imperialists committed acts of aggression against Soviet Russia in 1918, inflicting colossal damage on her economy and taking a heavy toll in human lives. Under the same pretext, fascist Germany unleashed her imperialist, predatory war to enslave the peoples of many countries, bringing untold suffering and calamity to mankind. When in 1956 the imperialists and Zionists undertook their aggression against Egypt, they declared Gamal Abdel Nasser a "communist agent". The United States raised the bugaboo of the "communist menace" in Vietnam when it waged its criminal aggressive war against the heroic Vietnamese people. The darkest forces of reaction invariably gather under the banner of anti-communism. What nourishes anti-communism? Lenin gave a clear answer to this question too: "People have not become saints because the revolution has begun. The toiling classes who for centuries have been oppressed, downtrodden and forcibly held in the vice of poverty, brutality and ignorance cannot avoid mistakes when making a revolution. And ... the corpse of bourgeois society cannot be nailed in a coffin and buried. The corpse of capitalism is decaying and disintegrating in our midst, polluting the air and poisoning our lives, enmeshing that which is new, fresh, young and virile in thousands of threads and bonds of that which is old, moribund and decaying."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Letter to American Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 65.

² Ibid., p. 72.

These words, characterising the early years of the development of the Soviet state, are most timely today for many newly independent countries. Anti-communism, implanted in these countries by imperialist propaganda from the United States and other Western powers, has a damaging effect on the national-democratic revolution. A communique issued after negotiations between delegations of the CPSU and the Arab Socialist Union in July 1971 stated: "The parties have expressed their conviction that anti-communism is detrimental to the liberation aspirations and national interests of the peoples and that there should be no place for it. It serves only the interests of international reactionary circles. Attempts to spread anti-communism are aimed at splitting the ranks of Arab revolutionaries who are fighting imperialism, Zionism and Israeli aggression in order to ensure the rights of the Arab peoples to free and independent development. These attempts are also aimed at disrupting the solidarity and cooperation between the Arab peoples and their friends."

THE UNITY OF PROGRESSIVE FORCES—THE GUARANTEE OF VICTORY FOR THE SOCIALIST ORIENTATION

Imperialism has always striven to disunite progressive forces, to cause splits in the national liberation movement. To achieve this aim, it invariably tries to capitalise on certain differences of opinion within the liberation movement, disagreements that arise primarily over the ways and means of solving internal socio-economic problems. By introducing the notion that the ideas of communism are incompatible with the national interests of the developing countries, and by constantly raising the bugaboo of a "communist menace", the neo-colonialists hope to create an atmosphere of distrust between Communists and national democrats and thus to prevent the formation of a united front of all progressive, revolutionary forces. Realising that the unity and solidarity of these forces is a formidable obstacle to their colonialist plans, the imperialists use every means at their disposal to foster reactionary nationalistic tendencies and direct them

against the Communist Parties and other forces engaging in the resolute and consistent struggle against neo-colonialism.

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out that the imperialists are trying to demoralise the progressive and patriotic parties, and use anti-communist prejudices to sow discord among the patriots. It stressed in its Main Document: "Imperialism provokes friction in developing countries and sows division between them by encouraging reactionary nationalism."

Imperialism, Zionism and internal reaction make persistent efforts to cause a split in the Arab national liberation movement, to evoke and sharpen internal differences of opinion in this movement and thereby weaken the common struggle of the peoples of these countries against imperialism and Zionism. The Maoists have contributed to these efforts with their policy of rousing nationalistic passions and spreading anti-Sovietism.

Pursuing an extremist line aimed at frustrating a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East, the Maoists provoked ultra-"Left" elements in the Organisation for the Liberation of Palestine to violent adventurist acts which damaged the interests of the liberation struggle of the Palestinian people. In September 1970, the Maoists openly urged Syria, Iraq and other Arab countries to take military action against Jordan "in defence of the Palestinians' cause".¹ Had such recommendations been carried out, it would have meant carrying out the American imperialist and Zionist plan "to get Arabs to fight Arabs".

Only the forces of reaction have any interest in a split in the liberation movement. Reaction wants to weaken this movement in order to abolish the political and democratic freedoms gained by the masses in countries with a socialist orientation. The reactionaries, supported by imperialism, make every effort to retain their privileges and to create favourable conditions for imperialist companies to carry on their predatory activities. Under these circumstances, the creation of a united front of all pro-

¹ *Jen-min jih-pao*, September 24, 1970.

gressive parties and patriotic forces is most important. In late 1971, the revolutionary democratic Baath Party of Iraq took the initiative in organising such a front. Today, a programme of national actions is being implemented which provides for the common struggle of progressive forces in Iraq against imperialism, Zionism and feudalism. Also somewhat earlier in 1971, an important step towards uniting progressive forces into a single front was made in Syria. The Congolese Labour Party has also initiated the creation of a front of progressive and patriotic forces. By closing ranks and strengthening its unity and solidarity, the Arab national liberation movement strikes a serious blow to imperialism and reaction. As seen from documents of the Baath Party and the Communist Party of Iraq, these parties have come to the conclusion that "individual contradictions between the progressive forces within Iraq must not be allowed to overshadow the main contradiction that exists between the progressive patriotic forces, on the one hand, and imperialism, Zionism and reaction, on the other".¹

The common and main goal standing before the national liberation movement and all of its sections is to destroy all forms of imperialist bondage, to free the peoples from exploitation and oppression. This supreme goal cements the ranks of all freedom fighters; it can be realised by the common efforts of national democrats, Communists and all freedom-loving forces. Taking part in the national fronts are workers and peasants, the numerically great urban middle strata, the intelligentsia, the progressive part of the military, and those among the bourgeoisie who are not connected with imperialist monopolies and are interested in creating an independent national economy. The creation of united anti-imperialist front of progressive and patriotic forces is an important step towards achieving this common goal.

Of course, the unification of progressive and patriotic forces into a single anti-imperialist front does not automatically lead to a "complete and eternal harmony" of interests of all the class forces involved. Class and ideological

¹ *Pravda*, December 4, 1971.

differences may persist and continue to give rise to feelings of prejudice and mistrust. But the need for unity in the face of a common enemy must be placed above any such differences. Communists and national democrats have the objective possibility of finding broad coincidence of interests in the process of defending and strengthening national independence, in the struggle against imperialist-backed internal reaction and in carrying out far-reaching social changes. The realisation of this possibility is the guarantee of success for the national-democratic revolution, the guarantee of victory for the socialist orientation.

THE NON-CAPITALIST WAY OF DEVELOPMENT AND THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE TWO SYSTEMS

The non-capitalist development of the Soviet Central Asian republics took place under conditions in which the world's first socialist state was in existence, and within its state boundaries. In Chapter 2 we already stressed that the very fact that the Soviet Central Asian republics were within the system of a single socialist state, coupled with the Leninist nationalities policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, ensured a rapid victory of non-capitalist development in the Soviet East.

In contrast to the Soviet Central Asian republics and Mongolia, the non-capitalist development of young Afro-Asian countries began and continues actually within the framework of the world capitalist market. But there is another and even more important difference in the conditions under which these countries are developing: they are developing in an era in which the world socialist system exists and is gaining in strength. The competition between the two world systems, their contest on a world-wide scale and in all spheres of human endeavour—economics, politics, ideology, culture—comprises the basic content of the present era. In this historical contest, the balance of social forces is increasingly changing in favour of socialism.

Examining the place and role of national liberation movements in the historical perspective of the transition from capitalist and pre-capitalist social relations to socialist relations, Lenin came to a conclusion of invaluable

theoretical and practical significance: "The social revolution," he wrote, "can come only in the form of an epoch in which are combined civil war by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries and a *whole series* of democratic and revolutionary movements, including the national liberation movement, in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed nations."¹ As we can see, Lenin regarded the national liberation movement as an inseparable part of the world social revolution, as an ally of world socialism in the struggle against the irreconcilable common enemy—world imperialism and reaction.

The existence and consolidation of the world system of socialism and its contest with world capitalism have created a qualitatively new situation, favourable to the struggle of all newly independent countries of Asia and Africa for their social progress. "*The world socialist system is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle*," says the Main Document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. "Each liberation struggle receives indispensable aid from the world socialist system, above all from the Soviet Union."²

This conclusion, based on a profound scientific analysis of world events, has received broad recognition of working people everywhere. Attempts by the Maoists to oppose this conclusion with their own petty-bourgeois thesis that it is not the world socialist system, but the national liberation movement that now comprises the main and leading force in the world revolutionary process, that the basic contradiction of our time is that between the countries of the Third World and imperialism, have met with failure, for this thesis is in obvious contradiction with reality, with the myriad of facts of postwar history in general, and the history of the national liberation struggle of peoples in particular, facts that demonstrate the decisive role of the support given by the forces of world socialism to the national liberation movements in

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 60.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 21.

the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the struggle of the peoples of these countries against imperialism.

THE REACTIONARY ESSENCE OF THE CONCEPT OF "TWO SUPER-POWERS"

In recent years, the Maoists have supplemented this thesis with the so-called doctrine of "two super-powers". According to this doctrine, the "two super-powers", the United States and the Soviet Union, who are allegedly trying to "recarve the world into spheres of influence and establish world dominance", stand opposed to the "small and medium-sized states" whose struggle "against the 'from strength' policies of the two super-powers is an inexorable historical trend".

The Maoists borrowed the basic propositions of the "super-power" concept from the arsenal of anti-communist propaganda used by the ideologists of imperialism. As everyone knows, the latter have been forced in our day to doctor their anti-communist theories in one way or another, such as, for example, by bringing in the false thesis of a so-called "degeneration" of socialism and capitalism. In his work, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", Lenin wrote: "Bourgeois scholars and publicists usually come out in defence of imperialism in a somewhat veiled form; they obscure its complete domination and its deep-going roots.... Cynical and frank imperialists who are bold enough to admit the absurdity of the idea of reforming the fundamental characteristics of imperialism are a rarer phenomenon."¹

In the present era, this methodological guideline of Lenin's has acquired new meaning. The great achievements of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the never-ending shocks within its system can no longer be concealed from the peoples. The traditional method of glorifying capitalism as "absolutely good" and condemn-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 286.

ing communism as "absolutely bad" would only end in the complete embarrassment of the bourgeois apologists. Hence their efforts to prove their theories by doctoring and distorting truth, by obscuring the class essence of things.

The characteristic feature of the "two super-powers" concept is that it ignores the class approach in examining the processes of the social development of different countries and peoples. Both the Maoists and bourgeois propagandists classify the Soviet Union and the United States as "two super-powers" on the basis of the fact that they are ahead of all other countries in terms of their level of military and economic development. Citing the fact that the USSR and the USA possess the world's most powerful nuclear missiles, the bourgeois anti-communists and the Maoists assert that only these states can control the world situation, and that the outcome of all international problems depends only on their struggle or their "compact". The adherents of the "two super-powers" concept also reduce the historical contest between the two socio-economic systems to conflict or agreement between the USSR and the USA. In an article entitled "Relations with the Soviet Union", American sociologist Marshall D. Shulman poses this question: "Is the conflict essentially between two ideologies, two political systems, two military machines, two giant nation-states?" And he answers that "...the conflict is best understood as a competition between the two preeminent great powers for military power and for political influence".¹

As we can see, even the ideologists of imperialism who, in order to confuse those who lack the necessary experience in making a scientific analysis of events and the ability to clearly see their class content, advance theories like that of the "two super-powers" to obscure the essence of the matter—even they do not try to deny the existence of a "world conflict", that is, the contest between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism, and the opposite positions of the USSR and the

¹ Marshall D. Shulman, "Relations with the Soviet Union" in *Agenda for the Nation*, Washington, 1968, pp. 373-74.

USA in this "world conflict" although they do ignore the class essence of this contest, portraying it as a struggle between the USSR and the USA "for military power and for political influence".

In their efforts to denigrate the Soviet Union, the Maoists have surpassed even the anti-communists of the West. They not only ignore the role of the USSR and other socialist countries in the struggle against international imperialism and the social essence and significance of this struggle, but even expatiate about a "deal" between the USSR and the USA, allegedly directed against the "small and medium-sized" countries.

The anti-communists of the West and the Maoists put an equal sign between the policies pursued by the USSR and the USA, and even equate the social goals of the armed forces of these countries. One has only to refer to the facts of history to see the absurdity of such views. Their groundlessness will become perfectly obvious to anyone who stops to think about what classes control the armed forces in the USA and the USSR and what class aims the armed forces in each country serve.

The armed forces of the peasants' and workers' state—the Soviet Union—were created in 1918 for the purpose of defending the young Soviet state from foreign intervention and internal counter-revolution. For over half a century, throughout the entire period of the Soviet state's existence, they have served only one goal—to protect the peaceful labour of the peoples of the USSR from aggression by international imperialism. The entire history of the Soviet Army bears witness to this: its heroic struggle against the intervention of 14 capitalist states (including the USA) in the very first years of the workers' and peasants' state; the struggle against the Japanese militarists in the 1930s; and finally, its immortal feat in the Great Patriotic War against the nazi invaders. In that war the Soviet Army not only drove the invader forces from the territory of the USSR, but also carried out its internationalist duty by contributing decisively to the liberation of many European peoples from fascist bondage. In ensuring for the Soviet people peaceful conditions for building a communist society, the defence might of the

USSR also impedes aggressive actions by international imperialism in other regions of the world. In the Report of the CC CPSU to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Active and consistent support from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is vitally important for the struggle of the peoples of Vietnam and the other countries of Indochina against the imperialist interventionists. The steps taken by the socialist states in the Middle East have become one of the decisive factors that have frustrated the imperialist plans of overthrowing the progressive regimes in the Arab countries."¹

The peoples of the world know what aims are served by the armed forces in the hands of the imperialists, and above all in the hands of US monopoly capital. Their entire history is one of aggressive, predatory wars, interference in the internal affairs of other countries and bringing their peoples under the dominance of foreign monopoly capital, a history of struggle against national liberation movements and revolutionary actions of working people. In the postwar period the forces of aggression and militarism have unleashed over 30 wars and military conflicts. In most cases, the initiator was the United States. The idea of establishing the neo-colonial dominance of American imperialism permeates the doctrine of so-called "flexible response" subscribed to by the United States. This doctrine envisages unleashing "local" wars far from American shores for the purpose of abolishing progressive regimes and suppressing national liberation movement under the pretext of "defending" the capitalist world from the "communist" and "Soviet" menace (Indochina, the Middle East, etc.). The myth about this nonexistent threat is a component propaganda element of the concept of "two super-powers" with which American imperialism tries to camouflage its aggressive policy.

The real situation today is that by virtue of their capabilities the USSR and the USA carry a great deal of responsibility for solving the problems of war and peace. But the Soviet Union has always drawn a clear line of

distinction between this responsibility and the reactionary idea of the two big powers' "exclusiveness", which the imperialist anti-communists and the Maoists are trying to foist upon the world's peoples. The Soviet Union has never sought to acquire privileges at the expense of any countries and peoples. It rejected from the outset the practice of a group of big powers dividing the world into spheres of influence. Right after its birth, the Soviet state, through Lenin, declared "...a complete break with the barbarous policy of bourgeois civilisation, which has built the prosperity of the exploiters belonging to a few chosen nations on the enslavement of hundreds of millions of working people in Asia, in the colonies in general, and in the small countries".¹ This has been confirmed by the whole history of the Soviet Union's existence and struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

In the international arena, the struggle of class forces is growing sharper as the two opposite socio-economic systems come forward with their irreconcilable ideologies. The advantages of socialism, which are revealed more and more with every passing year, accelerate the decay of capitalism as an obsolete and unjust system. The attraction of socialism for millions of people in the world is growing stronger and stronger. *Hence the efforts of imperialist ideologists to "renovate" capitalism by attempting to extend to it many features of a socialist society and at the same time to "degrade" socialism by ascribing capitalist features to it.* Through this kind of doctoring, the authors of the "two super-powers" concept try to provide it with a kind of socio-economic basis. It consists of the so-called theory of the "growing similarity" between the Soviet Union and the USA.

Citing the fact that the USA and the USSR use many of the same kinds of machines, employ many of the same kinds of technical processes and run into many of the same kinds of problems in the scientific and technological revolution, American bourgeois writers say that this

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 424.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 11.

indicates the "social similarity" between the two countries. The subtext of this and similar assertions is apparent: the revolutionary forces of today, it says, have no need to struggle for socialism, since capitalism has changed its nature and has come to resemble socialism, and the latter has acquired capitalist features.

But no kind of ideological manipulations can conceal, much less cure, the incurable ulcers of capitalism—the steady decline in the living standard of the broad masses of working people and the growth of unemployment, on the one hand, and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a small group of monopolists, on the other; racial and social inequality; and aggressive wars. No approximation of the levels of industrial development between the socialist and capitalist countries can ever remove their socio-political differences without a social revolution. This Marxist axiom is known today not only by Communists and all fighters against capitalism. The prominent American bourgeois scholar Hans Morgenthau states that the Soviet Union and the United States "face each other ... as the fountainheads of two hostile and incompatible ideologies, systems of government and ways of life..."¹

Public ownership of the means of production; the abolition of the exploitation of man by man; the intellectual emancipation of the working people; the steady growth of labour productivity, which is achieved by applying new techniques and improving technological processes and is accompanied by a constant rise in the living standard of the population; a planned socialist economy—these are the basic fountainheads of the rapid progress of the USSR in all spheres of human endeavour. The socialist industrialisation of the USSR began when the United States was already an advanced capitalist country. In 1917, the industrial production of the Soviet state amounted to only three per cent of the world's industrial production and a little over 10 per cent of the industrial production of the United States. But socialism began to move forward at a rapid rate. In

¹ *Foreign Affairs*, April 1967, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 428-29.

1960, the Soviet Union's volume of industrial production equalled 55 per cent of that of the United States. In 1969, it was already close on 70 per cent of the American level. American economist Victor Perlo has calculated that in 1940, the USSR lagged behind the United States by nearly 40 years, in 1960, by 14 years, and in 1967, the gap had been reduced to 6 years. Now the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States in many sectors of the scientific and technological revolution. It was the first to place nuclear energy at the service of peaceful purposes, and the first to begin the exploration of space, having placed an artificial satellite in orbit around the earth.

The ideologists of imperialism have to reckon with the successes of communism in their propaganda. By ignoring the initial positions at which the growth of the socialist economy began and playing up the fact that in level of economic development the United States still holds first place in the world, the authors of the "two super-powers" concept try to belittle the unquestionable advantages of socialism and proffer monopoly capitalism's road of development in the United States as a model. Such is the other side of this reactionary concept that anti-communist and Maoist propaganda tries to thrust upon the peoples of Asia and Africa.

The ideologists of Maoism spread this unscientific concept to confuse the masses, to impede their understanding of the events taking place in the world, to undermine their revolutionary zeal in the struggle for socialism and to ideologically disarm the national-democratic detachments of the liberation movement that are leading their countries along the non-capitalist road to socialism.

NEO-COLONIALISM, THE ENEMY OF THE SOCIALIST ORIENTATION

The concept of "two super-powers" is only one of the manifestations of the ideology of neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialism is an aggregate of ideological, economic and military relations that flow from the nature of state-monopoly capitalism and are imposed upon the newly free states for the purpose of keeping these countries

within the world system of imperialism as areas of "lagging capitalism". Above all, neo-colonialism makes use of the Third World countries' economic and financial dependence on the imperialist powers.

To one extent or another all imperialist powers pursue a neo-colonialist policy in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Each policy has its own features, which depend on the specificity of state-monopoly capitalism in the given imperialist country. But whatever particular features the policy of one or another imperialist power may have, neo-colonialism, having become the practice of present-day relations between imperialist and developing countries, has also acquired certain general features and patterns.

Firstly, neo-colonialism reproduces and intensifies the dependence of the young countries on the world capitalist economic system primarily through a system of indirect, camouflaged exploitation that relies on new devices and methods of expansion (various forms of so-called "aid", economic integration treaties, the manipulation of prices and exchange rates, etc.).

Secondly, much more characteristic of neo-colonialism than of former colonialism is the merger of the power of the imperialist state with the power of its monopolies into a single foreign policy mechanism. The imperialist states watch over the interests of monopoly capital in the developing countries, play the role of "guarantors" of their investments, and promote the penetration of foreign private capital into the economies of these countries.

Thirdly, neo-colonialism actively "participates" in socio-economic changes with the aim of establishing capitalist practices in the young states.

Fourthly, neo-colonialism works to undermine the equal cooperation of young national states with the countries of the world socialist system.

Neo-colonialism is the main and irreconcilable enemy of non-capitalist development in the countries of Asia and Africa. One of the primary strategic aims of the imperialist powers that pursue a neo-colonialist policy is to stop this progressive development towards socialism

and to retain key economic and political positions in the newly independent countries. In its efforts to abolish progressive, socialist-orientated regimes, imperialism does not hesitate to organise armed aggressions against them. The inspirers and chief patrons of the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries in 1967 were the aggressive circles of the United States and other imperialist powers. The armed aggression of the Portuguese colonialists against Guinea in 1970 was also connected with imperialism's subversive activities against the socialist orientation in Africa. Imperialist circles were behind the fascist counter-revolutionaries, who carried out a coup d'état in Chile in 1973 and overthrew the Allende democratic government.

However, it is becoming more and more difficult and dangerous for imperialism to base its policy strictly on direct force, on administrative-colonial coercion, as it used to do and still does wherever colonies exist (for example, in the Portuguese possessions in Africa). Force—armed intervention by imperialists with respect to a newly independent country—is today war against a sovereign state. Gross interference by imperialism in the internal affairs of politically independent states arouses strong indignation throughout the world. Now that these countries have stepped out into the international arena as independent states and are strengthening their ties with the world socialist system, imperialism has to resort to more flexible forms and methods of its policy, continually modifying and improving it.

In the economic sphere, neo-colonialist policy is aimed at maximally strengthening the imperialist exploitation of newly independent countries. Imperialism exploits these countries through the world capitalist market, with which they are still strongly connected. To this end it uses the mechanism of nonequivalent exchange and price manipulations as well as the mechanism of imperialist trusts. A clear example of this can be seen in Africa.

Two-thirds of Africa's exports are agricultural products and one-third is mineral raw materials. In the 1960s, more than 80 per cent of African exports (excluding the Republic of South Africa) went to the industrial

capitalist countries. As a consequence of economic backwardness, and especially because there is little or no production of the means of production, the African countries have to buy primarily industrial products, the prices on which are constantly rising, and sell their traditional goods at constantly falling prices. Caught in these "price scissors" in the world capitalist market, African countries lose billions of dollars annually to industrially developed capitalist countries. President Leopold Sedar Senghor of Senegal has pointed out that over a period of 12 years, prices on a ton of goods imported from Europe by the African countries went up 19 per cent, while a ton of exported African goods became cheaper by 4 per cent. "The more we work, the less we make,"¹ this eminent African statesman concluded.

"The extremely slow development of Africa's productive forces within the framework of the world capitalist economy stems largely from the increasing export of profits by the monopolies and the robbing of Africa by unequal trade. According to UN figures, Africa's annual gross product amounts to only 2 per cent of the cost of the total product of the whole capitalist world, although Africa's population approaches 10 per cent of the world total. In terms of volume, the African states continue to lag behind the developed countries in per capita industrial production by 24 times."²

The gigantic gap in economic development between the newly independent countries and the imperialist states is more and more widened by the plundering activity of the imperialist monopolies. These monopolies still control almost 90 per cent of the oil extraction and the major share of the extraction of various minerals in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Between 1965 and 1969 alone, the total profits exported by neo-colonialism from Third World countries reached \$ 30,000 million. In some newly independent countries, the outflow of capital exceeds the inflow of private foreign investments. As a result, a manifestly abnormal situation has arisen in which the flow

¹ Quote from *The Countries of Africa*, Moscow, Politizdat, 1969, pp. 46-62 (in Russian).

² *Neo-Colonialism in Africa*, Moscow, 1967, p. 16 (in Russian).

of capital goes not from the industrial capitalist states to the developing countries, but the other way round. The developing countries are in fact financing the imperialist countries. Until such time as this situation is changed there is little likelihood of high development rates in the developing countries. The outflow of capital from the developing countries does great damage to their economic development. The outflow of huge sums from these countries in the form of profits, interest and dividends (to say nothing of overpayment for freight, losses in the price squeeze, etc.) impedes the development of their economies, significantly lowers the standard of living of the population and creates a number of other hardships. "Neo-colonialism," said Gamal Abdel Nasser, "emerged attempting to attain the same aims of exploitation as the old colonialism, using new methods...."¹ Addressing the 15th Session of the UN General Assembly, President Sékou Touré of the Republic of Guinea said that "imperialism, modifying the classical forms of oppression, has modernised its means of dominance."²

A new and universal way of implementing neo-colonialist policy is through "aid" programmes. In fact, it is through these programmes that neo-colonialism can be seen in its most concentrated form.

After the colonial superstructure of imperialism was demolished, the focal point of the struggle of the newly independent countries shifted to their economic and social renaissance, to the raising of the living standards of the masses. However, the solution of these problems is almost impossible without effective outside assistance, because the newly independent states themselves lack the necessary capital, technical experience and skilled personnel. The responsibility for all these lacks lies directly with imperialism, which had given birth to the system of colonialism, a system by which the imperialist powers kept the peoples in bondage. It would, of course, be historically just to demand that imperialism return all the resources it had stolen from the developing countries

¹ Colim Legum, *Pan-Africanism*, London, 1962, p. 118.

² *Izvestia*, October 12, 1960.

without compensation. But by virtue of its very nature, imperialism would never agree to this.

In view of the competition between the two socio-economic systems, however, imperialism finds that it must agree to certain concessions for strategic reasons. In a number of cases, imperialist powers export private and state-monopoly capital not only for the sake of amassing superprofits, but also to strengthen the capitalist basis and the bourgeois political superstructure in newly independent countries. New tendencies in the international capitalist division of labour also have a role to play.

In the early years of the newly independent countries' struggle for economic independence, the imperialist monopolies did everything possible to preserve the colonial economic structure in them and blocked even the slightest attempts at their industrialisation. But under conditions of expanding economic ties between the socialist states and the newly independent countries, the neo-colonialists found that they could no longer control the development of the politically independent countries using their previous methods. Consequently, they began to modify their position on this question.

Analysing this tendency, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Victor Tyagunenko stresses that the monopolies do not have in mind "the creation of developed, modern industries with complete production cycles, but merely the production of separate units, component parts or semi-finished products.... Recognising that accelerated socio-economic development of the former colonies is inevitable and that it is impossible to re-establish the same kinds of relations with them, the more far-sighted capitalists now see their basic task as gaining control over their economic development. They seek to guide this process in a direction which will enable them to keep the developing countries within the world capitalist system, and at the same time to seize potentially vast markets and enrich themselves by exploiting the extremely cheap manpower in these countries.

"When the imperialist monopolies build enterprises in the developing countries for the production of certain

kinds of equipment, units and parts, it would seem that they are meeting these countries' needs, for they can then somewhat increase employment, expand their exports with finished products, and raise the overall indices of economic development. But this has advantages for the monopolies too. As they face ever sharpening competition on the world markets, they now have a chance, at the expense of the developing countries, to reduce production costs and expand their markets. Using the experience of old colonial firms in boosting labour productivity and keeping wages low, and comparing available information on natural resources, many monopolies are hastening to cash in on the advantages of production in these countries."¹

Continuing his analysis, Tyagunenko points out that in the building of manufacturing enterprises neo-colonialism observes the following principle: labour-consuming and technologically simple production for the developing countries, and capital-consuming and technologically complex production for the industrial countries. He comes to the conclusion that, in the first place, "this policy pushes the developing countries into the backyard of scientific and technological progress and, in the second place, the emerging international capitalist division of labour again dooms the developing countries to an unequal and subordinate position. Needless to say, this model of the new international division of labour favours only the imperialist monopolies; for the developing countries it can only mean a new form of bondage."²

The building of any enterprises in newly independent countries and the granting of any loans to these countries are advertised by the imperialist states as a manifestation of concern for their national interests and as "disinterested aid". But how, concretely, does this "aid" influence the socio-economic processes in the developing countries? A study of various "aid" programmes shows that it is:

a) *an instrument for promoting the development of private enterprise in the African countries.* Receiving government

¹ *International Affairs* No. 1, Moscow, 1971, p. 11.

² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

subsidies, the monopolies increasingly engage in the practice of creating in the newly independent countries mixed firms and companies in which local capital participates. American economist Charles Wolf, Jr. states that "as a result of economic aid, the private sector in most underdeveloped countries is very likely to be absolutely and relatively larger than it otherwise would be".¹

In an effort to expand and strengthen the private sector in Africa, the imperialist powers began to make state investments in this sector. In the Federal Republic of Germany, a German Society of Development was founded for this purpose. It contributes its share to the capital of "partnership" companies emerging in Africa in which local capital takes part, and gives financial assistance to African entrepreneurs;

b) *an instrument for counteracting the development of African countries along the non-capitalist road.* The newly independent countries that have declared their main objective to be the construction of socialism naturally run into many difficulties on the way to creating the material prerequisites of socialism. Neo-colonialism uses these difficulties to discredit the non-capitalist way. In November 1965, the United States Government officially declined a request made by the president of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, to supply Ghana with 127 million dollars' worth of agricultural surpluses over a period of seven years. This refusal was designed to aggravate the economic difficulties in Ghana. However, after the coup d'état in Ghana, the United States began supplying it with foodstuffs.

When it became apparent that Guinea had chosen the non-capitalist road, the US Agency for International Development slashed its previously planned "aid" to Guinea for the 1966/67 fiscal year to almost a quarter of the 1965/66 figure—from \$ 24.6 to \$ 6.8 million. Its financial assistance to the Ivory Coast, on the other hand, was increased. The imperialist powers reduced their state aid to Algeria for the same political motives.

¹ *The United States and the Developing Economies*, edited by Gustav Ranis, New York, 1964, p. 44.

Between 1962 and 1964, such aid was cut from \$ 357.6 million to \$ 191.2 million. By first orienting construction projects in the newly independent countries towards American loans and credits and then refusing to grant them, the imperialists frustrate the implementation of these countries' economic development plans;

c) *an instrument for undermining the non-capitalist state sector with the aim of switching it to a capitalist basis.* The state sector promotes the rapid development of the productive forces in the newly independent countries. Under conditions of democratic state power this sector can become the starting point for building socialism. For this reason the imperialists do everything they can to undermine it. For one thing, they step up their activity in building mixed enterprises in which local and monopoly capital participates. This practice assumes especially broad scope in states where the tendency towards development along non-capitalist lines is increasing. Neo-colonialism spares no effort to suppress these tendencies. On the other hand, in countries where private enterprise was and remains the basis of economic development (for example, the former French colonies, except Guinea and Congo [Brazzaville]), the neo-colonialists are quite willing to finance the state sector. For instance, French capital is enlarging its participation in national companies in the state and state-private sectors, subordinating them to its control;

d) *an instrument for broadening the social basis of state-monopoly capitalism.* The imperialist powers attach great importance to this aspect of "aid". Unlike "classical colonialism" which, in the sphere of social relations, depended primarily on tribal chiefs and feudal elements, neo-colonialism banks on the national bourgeoisie and strives to create a privileged class that is tied to imperialism with financial strings. Neo-colonialism works to establish the national bourgeoisie as a force that will counteract social revolution with its tendencies towards socialism, and to involve it, in partnership with the imperialist monopolies, in the exploitation of the natural riches of the newly independent countries. Also typical of neo-colonialism are its efforts to create a broader social

basis for itself out of various social strata through intensified ideological propaganda aimed at instilling bourgeois notions in the minds of the youth of newly independent countries. Neo-colonialism uses a variety of ways to help train local personnel that show promise of being staunch supporters of the capitalist way of development. The United States passed a law on international education which permits the government to recruit American teachers for work in the developing countries. The imperialist states grant educational loans and credits on favourable terms in order to have a chance to control the educational systems in the Third World. For example, in 1966, the International Development Association granted the Government of Kenya credits amounting to \$ 7 million over a period of 50 years for the development of education. Repayment is to begin only in 1976, at a rate of 1 per cent per year for the first ten years and 3 per cent annually over the remaining 40 years. Almost simultaneously, the University of East Africa in Kenya received a 40-year loan, guaranteed by the Kenya Government, from the US Agency for International Development to the amount of \$ 850,000, also on easy terms.

One of the specific features of neo-colonialist expansion is that it is carried out by the state machinery of the imperialist powers in combination with the expansionist activity of monopoly capital. Imperialism backs up its economic incursion into the newly independent countries with ideological diversion of unprecedented scope, the main purpose of which is to falsify Marxist-Leninist science and the teaching on the class struggle and to discredit the non-capitalist way of development. The United States Information Agency (USIA) alone carries on propaganda activities in 106 countries, distributing through its branches 145 newspapers and magazines in almost all of the basic languages of the world. The US government-owned radio station, the Voice of America, broadcasts more than 800 hours a week to foreign countries and transmits its programmes over the television networks of 87 states. The USIA employs some 4,500 specialists, and the government spends about \$ 170 million a year for waging "psychological warfare" abroad, which

is considerably more than the national income of many of the developing countries.¹

It is not part of the task of this book to make a detailed examination of the neo-colonialist ideology. However, it is well known that the basic content of neo-colonialist ideology and propaganda is anti-communism, which the ideologists of anti-communism try to instill in the minds of people by the most diverse and most refined methods. Along with the frankly hostile approach there has been an increase in recent years in so-called "positive" anti-communist propaganda. It consists essentially in revising the basic theoretical propositions of Marxism-Leninism, declaring them to be "obsolete", and in working out a "constructive" programme for the socio-economic modernisation of the newly independent countries, etc. However, this approach pursues the same strategic goal as the others, and that is to counteract the attractive force of the ideas of scientific socialism in the Third World and to undermine the growing cooperation between the socialist countries and the newly independent states. Rupert Emerson, a Harvard University professor, writes: "If countries cannot be forced to climb on the anti-communist bandwagon, it is at least desired to keep them safely out of the enemy camp...."

Neo-colonialism not only uses new forms and methods of economic expansion, but also renovates its old doctrines and concepts. Drawing on their rich and varied experience in deceiving the public, the imperialists hope to impede the world revolutionary process, an inseparable part of which is the national liberation movement.

WORLD SOCIALISM—A POWERFUL SUPPORT FOR NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT

The existence and development of the world socialist system inevitably promotes the progress of all peoples. In the present era, no country in Asia, Africa or Latin

¹ Robert E. Elder, *The Information Machine*, New York, 1968, pp. 326, vii.

² *Foreign Policy and the Developing Nation*, edited by Richard Butwell, University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, 1969, p. 216.

America can successfully move towards socialism if it remains isolated from the world socialist system and does not establish many-sided ties with it. The 24th CPSU Congress pointed out the great importance of the world socialist system for the social development of the whole of mankind. What accounts for this decisive role of the world socialist system?

The contribution of the world socialist system to the common cause of the anti-imperialist forces, to their struggle for socialism, depends above all on its growing economic strength. The national economies of the socialist countries are developing at faster rates than the national economies of the imperialist states. World socialism has taken the lead in a number of areas of scientific and technological progress. Supported by its constantly growing economic and defence strength, the world socialist system increasingly binds the aggressive forces of imperialism and closes off possibilities for them to export counter-revolutions and suppress national liberation movements. In the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 24th Party Congress, Leonid Brezhnev noted that "many of the imperialist aggressors' plans were frustrated thanks to the existence of the world socialist system and its firm action".¹ This can be seen clearly from the example of the Arab world.

In 1956, Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal company. In response to this legitimate action, Britain, France and Israel undertook treacherous aggressive actions aimed at bringing the Egyptian people to its knees and to restore the colonial order in Egypt and the entire Middle East. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries came out vigorously in Egypt's defence, and the tripartite aggression was stopped. In 1957, the countries of the world socialist system blocked imperialist plans for direct aggression against Syria. The following year, American imperialism was compelled to call off its armed intervention in Lybia and withdraw its forces from that country as a result of the energetic actions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 9.

When in June 1967, Israel, with all-round support from the United States, embarked on aggression against the Arab states, a meeting of the leaders of Communist Parties and heads of state of the European socialist countries took place in Moscow. It unanimously adopted a Statement on the Middle East in which a serious warning was given to the Israeli aggressor. Thanks to the vigorous actions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the Israeli aggression was stopped and condemned. The plans of imperialism and Zionism to eradicate progressive Arab regimes failed. Relying on the international support of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist system, the Arab countries, and above all the Arab Republic of Egypt and Syria, re-established and strengthened their defence potential in the face of the aggressor. "Not only Egyptians," said Gamal Abdel Nasser, "but all struggling peoples highly value the sincere and honest support of the Soviet Union. The USSR is helping us to fight for peace and the liberation of our land.... Without the Soviet Union we would be unable to realise our aspirations."

The growing strength of the socialist system is of crucial importance to the newly independent countries that have chosen the non-capitalist way of development.

The internationalist principles which the Soviet Union consistently applies in practice found their expression in the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between the USSR and the UAR (now the ARE) that was signed in Cairo on May 27, 1971. Article 2 of the Treaty reads: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as a socialist state, and the United Arab Republic, which has set itself the aim of reconstructing society along socialist lines, will cooperate closely and in all fields in ensuring conditions for preserving and further developing the social and economic gains of their peoples."¹

The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between the USSR and the ARE opened up new horizons for developing and strengthening equitable cooperation between the USSR and Egypt in the political, economic, scientific,

¹ *New Times* No. 23, June 1971, Moscow, p. 8.

technical, cultural and other spheres. Embodied in the Soviet-Egyptian treaty are the internationalist principles of relations between socialist states and countries developing along non-capitalist lines. As Leonid Brezhnev has pointed out, "The close friendship, mutual support and mutual understanding that distinguish the relations of the Soviet Union with progressive Arab states have found brilliant expression in the content of this treaty. We regard this document as further evidence of the growing consolidation of the anti-imperialist front of the peoples."¹

In an address to the 2nd Congress of Communist Organisations of the East in 1919, Lenin said that the peoples of the East could not free themselves of imperialist tyranny without the help of the international working class and that "the international proletariat is the only ally of all the hundreds of millions of the working and exploited peoples of the East".² The guarantee of success in the newly independent nations' struggle for social progress lies in strengthening the alliance of all anti-imperialist forces.

A) THE ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OF THE SOVIET UNION AND OTHER SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

In defining the character, goals, and forms of the foreign economic ties of one or another state, Marxists proceed from the character of that state's socio-economic structure. A capitalist state uses foreign economic ties in order to enrich itself by exploiting nations that are less developed economically and technologically. Underlying the development of foreign economic ties both under capitalism and under socialism is the objective need for international division of labour. However, capitalism uses international division of labour as a means of exploitation and enrichment. In contrast to capitalism, socialism creates an entirely new type of international economic relations, to which exploitation and unequal relations are alien.

¹ *Pravda*, June 12, 1971.

² V. I. Lenin, "2nd Congress of Communist Organisations of the East", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 163.

The first state act of the young Soviet Republic—the Decree on Peace—and the subsequent foreign policy measures of the Soviet Government that were worked out with the direct participation of Lenin, marked the emergence of new and just international relations. These relations are based on socialist principles—the equality of big and small nations and states, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. They are based on the principles of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, provide for equitable economic and cultural cooperation and reject any conditions that might infringe upon the sovereignty or belittle the national dignity of peoples.

Referring to the future relations between the Soviet state and the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Lenin wrote in 1916: "We shall endeavour to render these nations, more backward and oppressed than we are, 'disinterested cultural assistance', to borrow the happy expression of the Polish Social-Democrats. In other words, we will help them pass to the use of machinery, to the lightening of labour, to democracy, to socialism."¹ This course is consistently followed by the Soviet Government and the CPSU, whose Programme says: "The CPSU regards it as its internationalist duty to assist the peoples who have set out to win and strengthen their national independence, all peoples who are fighting for the complete abolition of the colonial system."²

Lenin was the initiator of the policy of rendering economic and technical assistance to peoples lagging in their development. The world's first programme of such assistance was carried out by the young Soviet Republic. As early as the 1920s, several enterprises were built in Mongolia with the help of the USSR. In the 1930s, the Soviet Union built two textile complexes in Turkey, grain elevators and rice-hulling mills in Iran, and cotton-jinning plants and other enterprises in Afghanistan. The Second World War interrupted these noble efforts, but

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

² *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1961, p. 497.

after the war, after the rehabilitation of its own economy, the USSR renewed its assistance to young national states, helping them to develop their economic and technological potential on an incomparably larger scale than before.

Depending on the concrete historical conditions, the Soviet Union sets itself the following basic tasks in its relations with newly independent countries:

- to support the social and political forces that struggle against the aggressive policy of imperialism, against colonial and racist regimes and neo-colonial expansion; to encourage progressive tendencies in socio-economic reconstruction and give active assistance to countries that have chosen a progressive road of development (with a socialist or anti-imperialist orientation); to promote closer ideological and political unity between the revolutionary vanguard of the national liberation struggle and the world communist and workers' movement. A resolution of the 24th Congress of the CPSU stresses: "The Congress attaches special importance to extending cooperation with countries taking the socialist orientation"¹;

- to develop mutually beneficial and equitable economic ties with all independent countries on principles that exclude exploitation and interference in internal affairs in any form; to promote the creation in these countries of the foundations of an independent economy.

The foreign economic policy of the socialist countries, which rests on the ideas of proletarian internationalism, also envisages the development of mutually advantageous trade and economic ties with all independent countries on the basis of such principles of international relations as respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, defence of peace, etc.

The world socialist system influences the developing countries' position on the world market in their favour. The socialist states strive to limit the sphere and possibility of various forms of exploitation to which the developing countries are subjected. By entering into economic and technical cooperation with these countries,

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 215.

the socialist states have broken the monopoly that the capitalist world has held on supplying them with machinery and equipment, credits, and scientific and technological know-how. This has resulted in certain improvements in the conditions under which the developing countries now deal with the industrial capitalist countries. The main forms of economic ties between the USSR and the developing countries are foreign trade and economic, scientific and technical cooperation. These forms are interconnected. Economic and technical cooperation is often the basis for expanding foreign trade ties. In its turn, the development of foreign trade often leads to the emergence and strengthening of economic and technical cooperation.

The socialist countries consider their task to consist in assisting the young states in the creation and development of an independent national economy, and above all a state sector. With this objective in view, the following specific forms of cooperation are practised:

- granting the young national states long-term credits on favourable terms;

- carrying out survey and design operations and delivering complete plant and materials for industrial enterprises and other projects;

- giving technical assistance in building and operating industrial enterprises, geological prospecting, the extraction of minerals, etc.;

- giving assistance in creating national geological, design, construction, research and other organisations;

- giving various kinds of assistance in training specialists and skilled workers for building and operating enterprises;

- sending specialists as advisers, consultants and experts to the developing countries.

All these forms of cooperation have assumed a stable character, and the terms on which they are carried out receive the approval of the governments and the progressive public of the young national states.

As mentioned before, Soviet credits are granted to the developing countries on favourable terms: the interest never exceeds 2.5 per cent per year; repayment of credits is

usually made over a period of 12 years after delivery of equipment is completed or after the plant or other project has been put into operation; and the credits are repaid in the form of the country's traditional exports or goods produced by the enterprises built with Soviet assistance. In certain cases, the USSR takes full responsibility for building an enterprise and putting it into operation. In this case, the Soviet Union also credits the local expenses connected with the building operations.

The concepts "economic, scientific and technical cooperation" and "economic aid to the developing countries" are often not clearly defined in the literature (particularly in the Western literature). The statistics of the Western countries, for example, include in the category "economic assistance" not only government grants, credits and loans made on favourable terms, but all private foreign capital investments, including direct investments on which foreign investors make an enormous profit. It is precisely these direct capital investments that have created the problem of a "reverse flow" of capital from the developing countries into the pockets of the international monopolies. Western ideologists and politicians need this dilated interpretation of "aid" in order to convince world public opinion, and above all the peoples of the developing countries, that the capitalist powers, including the former parent countries, want to help the former colonies and semi-colonies and are prepared to make great material sacrifices. By including into the category of "aid" all investments and reinvestments, they "prove" that some imperialist powers, France for example, place more than 1 per cent of their national income at the disposal of the developing countries. According to such calculations, the Western countries in the period 1961-70 gave economic "aid" to young national states to the amount of \$ 11,000 million.¹ But these figures paint a false picture, for they do not reflect, for example, the reverse flow of capital from the developing countries, and the aid figure includes private investments and even reinvestments.

¹ 1971 Review. *Development Assistance. Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee*, OECD, Paris, 1971, p. 34.

Private foreign capital is invested in enterprises belonging to foreign companies and, consequently, is actually not integrated into the national sector of the economies of the given countries. Moreover, foreign capital often stands opposed to national capital as a competitor.

Reinvestment of profits derived from local operations of foreign companies accounts for the basic growth (60 to 70 per cent) of private foreign direct capital investments in the developing countries. Western statistics also include reinvested profits in the category of "economic assistance to developing countries", ignoring the reverse movement of capital, which usually exceeds the volume of capital reinvested in the developing countries.

Let us cite the testimony of some foreign writers. French economist Pierre Jalée, for example, advises us that as a whole—taking into account the interest on state credits and loans—the return on the investments made by the basic capitalist powers in the countries of the Third World in 1964 amounted to \$ 7,500 million.¹ This sum does not include profits from non-equivalent trade. According to US Department of Commerce data, American monopolies withdrew profits amounting to \$ 17,000 million from the Latin American countries over a 15-year period (1952-1967), not counting profits reinvested locally.

A special edition of the magazine *Jeune Afrique*, entitled *Afrique 1969. L'année politique et économique*, contains data showing that in 1969 the countries of Africa paid back to their creditors amounts equalling 20 to 25 per cent of their national budgets. "But considering the fact that foreign state aid to these countries is estimated at the same figure," the magazine said, "this means that aid for development serves only to assure private investors the payment of interest on their investments. This means that the dependence of the African countries is increasing."²

Statistics indicate that the total profit presently derived by the imperialist powers from the exploitation of the de-

¹ Pierre Jalée, *The Pillage of the Third World*, New York-London, 1967, pp. 76, 77.

² *Afrique 1969*, Numéro Spécial Annuel de *Jeune Afrique*, Paris, 1969.

veloping countries far exceeds their annual state and private capital investments in these countries. This clearly shows what the so-called assistance given by the imperialist powers to the developing countries means in fact and who enjoys its fruits.

We spoke earlier of the really effective assistance that the socialist countries give the developing countries—assistance with financial, material and human resources.

This assistance, firstly, promotes the development of the national sector of the economy of the newly independent countries towards balanced and steady economic growth, helps to raise their standard of living, leads to a decline in the dependence on foreign capital, and paves the way for ultimately placing foreign enterprises under the control of the national sector; secondly, it is given on favourable terms, substantially differing from market terms to the advantage of the newly independent countries; and thirdly, it does not lead to financial or any other kind of bondage, nor does it drain the economy of the recipient states as a result of the outflow of large financial resources.

Economic and technical cooperation between the USSR and economically underdeveloped countries began, as already underscored, in the very first decade of the Soviet Union's existence. Prior to the Second World War, the USSR engaged in such cooperation with only a few countries—Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Mongolia and China. Although during that period economic and technical cooperation was not extensive, it was nonetheless fundamentally significant, because for the first time in history a new type of international relations were being established, relations based on the complete equality of the countries involved.

After the Second World War, the Soviet Union concluded economic and technical cooperation agreements with Afghanistan (1954) and India (1955). Since then, this cooperation has become comprehensive.

While in 1955, the Soviet Union had economic and technical cooperation agreements with only two developing countries and by 1960 with 14, by the beginning of 1970, it had such agreements with 40 developing countries.

The agreements provided for assistance in building over 744 industrial enterprises and other projects in various branches of the economy and culture. By January 1, 1970, 325 of these were already operating.¹ Economic and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and the developing countries has become comprehensive and universal. The rapid expansion of economic and technical cooperation with the developing countries is typical of all socialist countries.

Hundreds of important projects have been and are being undertaken in Africa with the economic and technical assistance of the socialist states. For example, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has helped build about 25 different enterprises and is participating in equipping approximately the same number of plants. The Hungarian People's Republic has supplied equipment for over 170 industrial plants and other projects—flour mills, hydrogen-producing plants, heat and power stations, glass works, etc. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has helped build 89 enterprises, 62 of which have already been put into operation.

Cooperation with the socialist countries has enabled a number of African states to create new branches of industry or production and to substantially increase their output of industrial goods.

The Arab Republic of Egypt has organised, for the first time, the production of thin steel sheet, coke, lubricating oils, welding electrodes, bare cable, surgical instruments, cast iron fittings, aluminum foil, etc. The Aswan hydroelectric power station alone has tripled Egypt's electricity-producing capacity. A machine-tool and instrument, a radio engineering, a chemico-pharmaceutical and other industries have been created in the country.²

In Algeria, Soviet organisations helped to rehabilitate and reconstruct a number of large enterprises in the state sector. At present, such enterprises as Ben Badis (agricultural machinery), Alelike (rail cars), Boulonneri,

¹ *Statistical Handbook of the Basic Indices of Economic and Technical Cooperation Between the USSR and the Developing Countries*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 1-2, 16 (in Russian).

² *Foreign Trade No. 7*, Moscow, 1971, p. 10.

Algerienne (metal products) are producing more than under the former French owners.¹ The steel mill in Annaba (which the Soviet Union is also helping to build) will enable Algeria to increase her steel production tenfold; the lead and zinc plant in el-Abiad will triple the production of raw materials; and when construction of the window glass shop in Oran is completed, the capacity of the glass industry will be increased by 50 per cent. The production capacity of the textile complex built with Bulgaria's help satisfies about 15 per cent of Algeria's domestic needs in textiles.

One indication of the successful development of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the developing countries is the fact that the present volume of deliveries of equipment and supplies for enterprises in these countries is more than five times greater than in 1960. The following table gives a breakdown of Soviet technical assistance to developing countries according to the field to which it is applied (in per cent).

Industry and power	72.8
Agriculture	4.7
Transport and communications	8.9
Geological prospecting	8.9
Education, culture, public health, and sports	4.1
Housing and public services construction	0.4
Other fields	0.2
	100.0

Thus, over 70 per cent of the aid provided for in the economic and technical cooperation agreements between the Soviet Union and developing countries are directed towards industrial development. More than half of all Soviet aid goes for rendering assistance in the construction of enterprises in heavy industry. An example of this kind of cooperation is the technical assistance that the Soviet Union gives to India, the ARE, Algeria, Iran, the Republic of Sri Lanka and other countries.

At the same time, Soviet assistance to the more economically backward Afro-Asian countries is directed, at the

¹ Ibid., p. 12.

request of the governments of these countries, first of all towards the development of certain branches of the manufacturing and food industries and agriculture, with the aim of satisfying the urgent needs of their populations as quickly as possible. This is the case, in particular, with such countries as North and South Yemen (the Yemeni Arab Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen), Nepal, Guinea, Somalia and others.

In accordance with intergovernmental agreements the USSR has pledged assistance in building a total of over 700 industrial enterprises and other projects; more than half of them are now built and operating. The following table gives an idea of what kinds of projects these are.

Number of Enterprises and Other Projects Built, in the Process of Being Built, or to Be Built in the Developing Countries with the Technical Assistance of the USSR — by Branches of the National Economy (As of January 1, 1971)

	As Per Agree- ments	In Opera- tion
TOTAL	709	353
I. <i>Industry</i>	323	139
Electric Power	44	16
Oil Extraction, Oil Refining and Gas	18	7
Coal	13	4
Ferrous Metallurgy	16	7
Non-Ferrous Metallurgy	16	2
Chemical and Petrochemical	12	3
Machine Building and Metalworking	53	32
Lumber, Pulp and Paper, Woodworking	2	1
Building Materials	10	5
Medical Industry	7	7
Light Industry	11	5
Foodstuffs, Meat and Dairy, Fish, and Flour and Cereals	87	36
II. <i>Agriculture</i>	103	47
III. <i>Transport and Communications</i>	61	45
IV. <i>Geological Prospecting</i>	57	23
V. <i>Education, Culture, Public Health, Sports</i>	146	91
VI. <i>Housing and Public Services</i>	7	4

Private capital coming from the capitalist countries often competes with national capital, undermines it, and makes it easier for the neo-colonialists to exploit the developing countries. The assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is directed basically towards developing the productive forces in their national sector. All of the enterprises built with the help of the USSR are from the outset wholly the property of the developing countries.

Of great importance for strengthening and developing the national economies of the developing countries is the discovery of mineral reserves necessary for the rapid development of industry. At present, the USSR helps 18 Afro-Asian countries to conduct geological prospecting. Large commercial reserves of mineral raw materials have been discovered and studied with the help of Soviet specialists. The mining of many kinds of minerals has been organised, and a strong raw materials base for industry is being created.

The Soviet Union has done much to help in the training of national cadres, one of the major problems that the young independent states face at the present time.

Assistance is rendered in different ways: Soviet specialists train citizens of the foreign countries on the spot in the course of building or operating plants; foreign specialists are given vocational training at Soviet enterprises and institutions; and the Soviet Union helps in the creation of national educational institutions in these countries.

More than 250,000 persons have already been trained with the help of the USSR, over 200,000 of which were trained in the course of building or operating enterprises. In addition to this, thousands of students and post-graduate students from the developing countries are studying in Soviet institutions of higher education.

An effective form of Soviet aid to the young independent states in the area of training specialists consists in helping these countries organise their own training systems and establish national educational institutions. The Soviet Union shares its experiences in the field of education. Over 120 educational establishments—institutes, techni-

cal schools, specialised and general secondary schools, and teaching centres—are being built in the developing countries with the help of the Soviet Union. About 80 of these are already functioning.

Thanks to Soviet assistance in training personnel, in the Arab Republic of Egypt, for example, 27 of the 32 industrial enterprises built with Soviet aid are now operated entirely by Egyptians. In Syria, a plant producing reinforced concrete sleepers and the Rastan hydroelectric power station, both built with the help of the USSR, are now operating without the participation of Soviet specialists. This is the pattern in all countries: as the projects built with the help of the Soviet Union are put into operation, the number of Soviet specialists is systematically reduced and they are replaced by trained local personnel. Assessing the significance and character of Soviet aid, Egyptian journalist Rifaat es-Said wrote the following about Soviet specialists working on the construction of the Aswan Dam: "Soviet people have laid the foundations of new attitudes to work: love of labour, labour heroism, enthusiasm for fulfilling production plans, emulation, etc. All this helps in the creation of a new type of man."

Here is another example showing how the economic and technical cooperation between the USSR and the developing countries promotes the strengthening of their national economies. In the construction of the first stage of the Bhilai iron and steel works in India, Soviet organisations agreed to prepare all the project documentation and supply almost 100 per cent of the equipment, machines and mechanisms. Subsequently, as a result of the assistance that the Soviet Union had rendered India in the construction of a number of machine-building plants, in establishing a design organisation and in the training of personnel, Indian enterprises were already able to supply for the construction of a new, even larger steel mill in Bokaro 65 per cent of the equipment, machines and mechanisms and to carry out 25 per cent of the total volume of survey and design work themselves.

The fact that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries help in the building of enterprises in the state sector

plays a highly important role in strengthening the independence of the economies of the developing countries. It enhances the influence of the state on the economic life of the given country and helps lay the foundations for a planned national economy, raise the rate of economic development, eliminate one-sidedness in the development of the economy, and weaken the influence of foreign monopolies. All this lends impetus to the struggle of the developing countries to overcome the consequences of the capitalist international division of labour.

B) THE FOREIGN TRADE OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES —
AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN THE PROGRESS
OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Foreign trade is an effective means of implementing the international division of labour. Under capitalism it assumes great economic and political importance in the struggle for profitable markets and cheap raw materials for "domestic" industry. It serves as a way to boost the national income of a capitalist country and a source of additional profits for the class of capitalists who can take advantage of the difference in production costs within their own country and abroad. This additional profit is a kind of international differential rent, formed as a result of the difference in the natural and other conditions under which one or another commodity is produced. This is what Karl Marx said on this score:

"Capitals invested in foreign trade can yield a higher rate of profit, because, in the first place, there is competition with commodities produced in other countries with inferior production facilities, so that the more advanced country sells its goods above their value even though cheaper than the competing countries.... The same may obtain in relation to the country, to which commodities are exported and to that from which commodities are imported; namely, the latter may offer more materialised labour *in kind* than it receives, and yet thereby receive commodities cheaper than it could produce them."¹

¹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1971, p. 238.

In advancing this proposition, Marx proceeded from the fact that exchange of commodities on the world market is made on the basis of international value, which is an average of national values realised on the world market. On these terms, even a country that is economically and technically less developed than others can profit from the international division of labour. Thus, if commodities are exchanged at fair world prices based on the international value of the commodities, then foreign trade is objectively mutually advantageous for countries that are on different levels of economic and technical development.

In present-day international trade relations, however, the imperialist powers strive to build their economic ties with the developing countries in such a way as to preserve and increase economic inequality. International exchange becomes a means of exploiting countries that are economically and technologically less developed, since the monopolies deform the prices on the world market in their own favour. Foreign trade under capitalism becomes a mechanism of this kind of exploitation.

At this point, we should say a few words about the so-called theory of comparative production costs, which is used by bourgeois economists to justify unfair trade between the industrial and developing countries, to help consolidate the division of labour that had taken shape between these two groups of countries historically, and to perpetuate the division of the world into the "industrial city" and the "world countryside". To be sure, if we divest the theory of comparative production costs of the apologetics of imperialist exploitation, then, in our view, the level of spending for the production of one or another commodity can and should be taken into account when analysing the mutual advantages of international commodity exchange and determining the optimal structure of foreign trade. Of course, the structure of foreign trade and its geography depend not only on the level of production costs, but also on a number of other factors. But the decisive one is the comparative cost level. Ignoring this could lead to voluntaristic actions, so that instead of bringing benefits, foreign trade could result only in large losses of national income.

Foreign trade serves as a means of enhancing the economic integration of countries, and this reflects the objective demands of the scientific and technological revolution. For this reason, the role of foreign trade in our time is growing. It is becoming an instrument not only of economic but also of scientific and technological progress, creating possibilities for the industrial development of countries that do not have their own industrial basis.

Within the framework of UN agencies and the UN Conference on Trade and Development, the socialist countries work towards the establishment of fair prices and the practice of concluding international trade agreements that take into account the interests of all participating countries. At the 23rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly (October 1968), Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Andrei Gromyko outlined the position of the Soviet Government with respect to international economic cooperation, stressing: "The Soviet Government considers correct the demands for a substantial increase in the developing countries' share of the profits derived from the development of their natural resources by foreign capital. It supports proposals for international agreements to raise the artificially depressed prices on fuel, raw materials and agricultural products on the world market and to lower the artificially raised prices on industrial goods imported by the developing countries."¹

Such international agreements should establish prices on the basis of actual production costs, and not on the basis of monopoly prices set unilaterally by imperialist capital and forced on the world market.

The Soviet Government's proposals provide the basis on which the socialist and developing countries can work together to counter the imperialist policy of discrimination in foreign trade and to transform foreign trade into a means of equitable and mutually advantageous international cooperation.

In calling for the elimination of the negative foreign trade practices that were engendered by the dominance of colonialism and imperialism, some scholars and politi-

¹ *Pravda*, October 4, 1968.

cians in the developing countries suggest that the socialist states unilaterally establish special prices for trade with them. However, this approach could not improve the conditions of trade on the international market. International trade at differentiated prices, depending on the economic level of the partner countries, is not only difficult to substantiate theoretically but impossible to realise in practice. Foreign trade in which not one but many prices for the same commodity exist would bring chaos to the world market and result in arbitrary price formation, speculation at the expense of the developing and socialist countries, and the transformation of foreign trade from a means of mutually beneficial division of labour into an instrument of political pressure. The value of a commodity is the objective basis of its national and international price.

These just demands are advanced by the developing countries. At the sixth special session of the UN General Assembly which met in April and May 1974 to discuss problems related to raw material resources and economic development, a "group of 77" developing countries presented a Declaration on the establishment of a new international economic order and advanced an Action Programme. Acknowledged in the documents worked out by the session on the basis of these projects was the right of the developing countries to control the activity of international corporations and the right to establish a fair relationship between the prices of the raw materials, raw material products and finished and semi-manufactured goods that the developing countries export, on the one hand, and the prices of the industrial goods, means of production and equipment that the Third World countries import, on the other.

International division of labour can function normally only if there is free exchange of commodities at average world prices. Consequently, it should not be a question of establishing artificial prices for specific countries, but of removing all distortions of average world prices and, in particular, of abolishing monopoly prices dictated by imperialist monopolies. It is advisable to remove obstacles to the expansion of the developing countries' trade, customs barriers and other limitations.

How can this be done? In view of the fact that approximately 75 to 80 per cent of the foreign trade of the developing countries is oriented towards the developed capitalist countries, a radical change in world prices cannot be achieved simply by altering the prices according to which the developing and socialist countries trade among themselves. The socialist countries account for only 7 to 8 per cent of the foreign trade turnover of the Third World countries. What assumes great importance therefore are joint economic and political actions of the developing and socialist countries to change the conditions of trade on the world market (coordinated efforts to stabilise the level of prices on raw materials, to conclude international trade agreements, including those that provide for fixed prices, etc.).

The expansion of foreign trade ties between the developing and socialist countries also serves to improve the condition of the developing countries' trade with the imperialist powers, for, in their attempts to impede the expansion of these ties, the monopolies are forced to make concessions and improve the conditions of trade.

The forms and mechanism of the socialist countries' foreign trade reflect the specific features of the socialist economy. The foreign trade of these countries is conducted by state organisations through which the state monopoly on foreign trade and foreign economic ties is realised. In certain cases, Soviet foreign trade associations participate in corresponding stock companies abroad. In some developing countries, mixed companies for the sale of Soviet exports to these countries are set up with the participation of Soviet organisations. Such companies operate, for example, in Morocco, Ethiopia, Nigeria and elsewhere.

An important element in the Soviet Union's foreign trade policy are bilateral trade treaties and payment, trade and economic agreements that specify the volume and nomenclature of goods to be supplied and the terms and methods of payment. The Soviet Union has trade treaties and agreements with more than 80 foreign states, 46 of which are developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In recent years, the practice of concluding long-

term trade agreements for three to five years has become increasingly widespread. The USSR now has such agreements with more than 30 countries. The contracting parties establish the contingents of basic goods for mutual deliveries for the entire period the agreements are in force. Provisions are made for an annual review and adjustment of these contingents. Some trade agreements stipulate that Soviet foreign trade organisations and foreign firms and organisations may conclude contracts involving goods not included in the basic commodity lists, including compensatory transactions and contracts for the delivery of goods in quantities over and above those provided for in the trade agreements.

According to the agreements, the parties are to observe the principle of balanced trade, which enables them to pay for goods received not with freely convertible currency or gold, but with deliveries of their own export production. The Soviet Union has concluded payment agreements with some countries that provide for foreign trade settlements, including a clearing, that is, a non-monetary, system of settlement.

Working to promote a rational and fair organisation of international economic cooperation, the socialist countries take an active part in a number of international organisations whose activities promote the normalisation of international economic relations. All the socialist countries are members of the UN Conference on Trade and Development and various other UN agencies dealing with economic and financial problems. However, the USSR does not take part in closed groupings such as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the European Economic Community, and so forth, which seek unilateral advantages for their member countries at the expense of the interests of the Third World countries.

After the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, trade between the USSR and the developing countries began to grow rapidly. In a short period of time—between 1960 and 1970—the volume of this trade increased from 784.8 million rubles to 2,981.5 million ru-

bles, that is, it was almost tripled.¹ The Soviet Union's trade with the developing countries during that period grew at a faster rate than its overall foreign trade turnover: in 1958, the developing countries accounted for 10.3 per cent of the Soviet Union's foreign trade turnover, and in 1970—13.5 per cent.²

Some foreign writers and politicians sometimes cite the fact that the absolute volume of the Soviet Union's and other socialist states' trade with the developing countries is still small in comparison with the trade volume of the Western countries. Indeed, according to US Department of Commerce figures, the US foreign trade turnover with the developing countries in 1968 was \$19,600 million, while the foreign trade turnover of the USSR with these countries that year was \$2,263.4 million.³

But what lies behind these figures? Are they really comparable?

Western statistics on the foreign trade of a capitalist country include in the export and import of the given country virtually any movement of goods across its border, including all deliveries made to that country's own foreign-based companies and their affiliates, which, of course, distorts the real picture of commodity turnover. For example, up to 60 per cent of all US exports to the developing countries, above all of machines and equipment, is directed to American companies and their affiliates operating in these countries, and only 40 per cent goes for the needs of their national sector.⁴ The same applies to US imports from the developing countries, a considerable part of which are goods exported to the USA by American companies. As concerns trade between the socialist and developing countries, it is conducted exclusively with the national sector of the latter. This is one of the essential differences between the trade practices of the socialist and capitalist countries.

Trade between Western companies and their affiliates

¹ *Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1961. A Statistical Survey*, Moscow, 1962 (in Russian); *Foreign Trade* No. 6, Moscow, 1970.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Foreign Trade* No. 6, Moscow, 1970.

⁴ See *World Marxist Review*, Prague, No. 5, Vol. 9, 1966, p. 40.

and departments has no direct relation to the national export and import of the developing countries. This circumstance should be reflected in the statistics, at any rate in UN statistics.

Thus, the social essence and significance for the developing countries of foreign trade with the capitalist and socialist countries are different. Consequently, any formal comparison of statistical data on foreign trade does not yield a true picture of the real substance of the matter.

To answer the question of why the socialist states have a smaller share in the overall foreign trade turnover of the developing countries than do the industrial capitalist countries, it should be remembered that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries established broad trade relations with the developing countries only after the latter had won their political independence, that is, 10 to 15 years ago. The Western capitalist powers, on the other hand, were well entrenched there since the time of colonial dominance. Moreover, despite the fact that the colonial peoples won political independence, the economic positions of the former parent countries and other imperialist powers in most of the newly independent countries have remained practically untouched, and in some places have even become stronger. Foreign companies impede the expansion of trade ties between the Third World and the socialist countries. Changing the structure of foreign economic ties requires a long time and the creation of the necessary internal and external prerequisites. The process of the developing countries' breaking away from economic dependence on the imperialist powers is only beginning.

Table 1 on page 207 gives an idea of the foreign trade ties between the Soviet Union and the developing countries.

The top ten states on the list include developing countries from every continent and of different political and ideological orientations. High on the list are Algeria, Egypt and Syria, countries that are moving along the non-capitalist road. It is quite natural that among the Soviet Union's trade partners are its neighbours, Afghanistan, India, Iran and Turkey.

The structure of the Soviet Union's trade with the developing countries indicates that it renders these countries

substantial assistance in creating the foundations of modern industry (see Table 2 on page 208).

As can be seen from Table 2, Soviet exports to the developing countries are of a productive character (machines and equipment, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, oil, timber), that is, goods these countries need to form their own industrial base as a foundation for economic and social progress.

A palpable part of the Soviet Union's total exports of machines and equipment goes to the developing countries. In 1970, the Soviet Union exported a total of 2,482.2 million rubles' worth of these goods, of which 596.7 million rubles' worth went to developing countries.¹ The basic stress in Soviet exports to these countries is on deliveries of the means of production.

While the socialist countries furnish the developing states with substantial quantities of machines and equipment exclusively for their national industry, and above all for state-owned enterprises, the capitalist countries send these states primarily consumer goods and foodstuffs. The machines and equipment they export to Asia, Africa and Latin America are mainly for equipping and modernising enterprises that belong to foreign capital.

What kinds of goods does the Soviet Union buy from the developing countries? Table 3 on page 209 gives an idea of the structure of Soviet imports from these countries.

The main items are foodstuffs (31 per cent) and textile raw materials and semi-manufactures (26 per cent). It is easy to see that these are the developing countries' traditional export items, the export of which gives them a chance to accumulate resources for industrial development. At the same time, the USSR buys products produced by these countries' young industry, thus helping to ensure a market for them and promoting the entrance of the developing countries onto the world market not only as suppliers of raw materials but as producers of manufactures and semi-manufactures. The structure of Soviet trade (and

¹ *Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1969. A Statistical Survey*, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian); *Foreign Trade No 6*, Moscow, 1970.

Table 1

Basic Trading Partners from Among the Developing Countries in the Export and Import of the USSR for 1970*
(in per cent)

Country	Export	Import
All Developing Countries	100	100
Including:		
Egypt	17.8	24.4
India	6.6	21.2
Iran	9.2	5.4
Algeria	3.4	4.9
Sudan	1.8	3.9
Ghana	0.5	3.5
Afghanistan	2.0	2.7
Pakistan	1.7	2.5
Argentina	0.1	2.5
Turkey	3.1	2.4
Indonesia	0.2	2.2
Brazil	0.1	1.3
Nigeria	0.6	1.8
Morocco	1.8	1.5
Syria	2.3	1.5
Sri Lanka	0.3	1.0
Cyprus	0.2	0.5
Iraq	3.2	0.4
Lebanon	0.7	0.3
Burma	0.2	0.1

* Source: *Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1970. A Statistical Survey*, Moscow, 1971 (in Russian).

that of other socialist countries) with the developing states is mutually advantageous for both sides.

The following example illustrates the character of Soviet import policy with respect to the Third World countries. In 1960, Soviet imports from India amounted to 61,500,000 rubles, 31 per cent of which were in manufactures and semi-manufactures (cable, sacks, cigarettes, footwear, etc.). In 1970, imports from India went up to 242,600,000 rubles, with over 44 per cent in manufactures

Table 2

Major Soviet Exports to Developing Countries*
(in millions of rubles)

Goods	1955	%	1960	%	1968	%	1969	%	1970	%
Total	427.8	100	303.7	100	1,263.4	100	1,520.4	100	1,835.9	100
Including:										
Machines and equipment	4.6	3.6	413.5	37.4	429.2	34.0	565.4	37.4	593.7	32.5
Coal	0.4	0.1	0.6	0.2	4.9	0.4	4.9	0.3	6.4	0.3
Petroleum and oil products	21.6	46.9	35.4	41.6	57.2	4.5	90.8	6.0	56.3	3.4
Ferrous metals	47.4	43.4	24.4	8.0	56.1	4.4	64.9	4.3	79.8	4.3
Non-ferrous metals	1.3	1.0	2.9	4.0	7.8	0.6	10.9	0.7	10.8	0.6
Chemical products	0.7	0.5	1.8	0.6	18.5	1.4	10.6	0.7	10.7	0.6
Timber and pulp and paper	40.6	8.3	25.3	8.3	36.0	2.85	48.0	3.4	52.9	2.9
Textile raw materials and semi-manufactures	—	—	—	—	0.8	0.06	1.5	0.4	0.3	—
Foodstuffs	10.0	7.6	30.9	10.2	96.2	7.6	135.6	8.9	97.8	5.3
Cultural and household goods	0.4	0.3	2.0	0.7	4.2	0.3	1.4	0.09	1.1	0.06

* Source: Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1969. A Statistical Survey (in Russian).

Table 3

Soviet Imports from Developing Countries*
(in millions of rubles)

Goods	1955	%	1960	%	1968	%	1969	%	1970	%
Total	176.2	100	481.0	100	774.0	100	992.4	100	1,146.6	100
Including:										
Ferrous metals	—	—	—	—	17.0	2.2	18.1	1.8	19.7	1.7
Non-ferrous metal ores	2.0	1.0	1.9	0.4	4.3	0.6	8.2	0.8	8.6	0.8
Dyes, varnish and paint materials	—	—	—	—	5.3	0.7	3.2	0.3	0.7	0.06
Hard wood (logs)	—	—	—	—	1.9	0.2	2.5	0.2	2.4	0.2
Textile raw materials and semi-manufactures	40.8	23.2	156.4	32.5	159.7	22.0	202.3	20.4	299.9	26.2
Raw hides (large and small)	10.5	6.0	30.9	6.4	33.4	4.3	37.5	3.8	42.8	3.7
Tobacco	0.4	—	2.5	0.5	6.9	0.9	6.9	0.7	11.6	1.0
Food products	57.4	32.6	103.3	21.5	294.3	38.0	366.0	36.8	359.9	31.4
Clothing and linens	—	—	—	—	17.9	2.3	26.3	2.7	28.4	2.5
Leather footwear	—	—	2.5	0.5	7.6	1.0	12.0	1.2	13.0	1.1
Cultural and household goods	0.1	—	0.5	0.1	0.9	0.1	—	—	—	—

* Sources: Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1969. A Statistical Survey (in Russian); Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1970. A Statistical Survey (in Russian).

and semi-manufactures (including metal-cutting machines, storage batteries, rolled steel, wire, tyres, textiles, clothing, etc.).¹

By increasing purchases of industrial goods and assisting the development of the young national industries of the developing countries, the socialist countries make it easier for the latter to repay credits. They strictly observe their commitments to accept as payment against credits traditional goods and goods produced at enterprises built with their assistance. This is one of the major prerequisites for ensuring continued rapid growth rates in the industrial export of the developing countries.

Of great importance now is the task of stepping up the growth rate of trade ties between the socialist and developing countries. Further expansion of the trade turnover between these groups of countries rests primarily on the developing countries' producing more goods that the socialist states can use as imports. In our view, the future expansion of economic cooperation between socialist and developing countries will take place both through the growth of trade ties within the framework of the existing import-export structure and on the basis of new export items from the developing countries. We have in mind above all the export to socialist countries of mineral raw materials and fuel. There are tremendous reserves in this area.

Of particularly great value to African states are increased imports by socialist countries of industrial goods. In one five-year period alone (1965-69), purchases by socialist countries of chemical goods in the African states grew more than 9-fold, and purchases of other industrial goods almost doubled.² In that same period, the import of foodstuffs increased by almost 100 per cent, and of petroleum and oil products by 250 per cent.

The purchase of goods produced by enterprises built with the help of socialist countries has an extremely favourable effect on the development of the national economies of African states. Of the latest examples, we might name

¹ *Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1961. A Statistical Survey* (in Russian); *Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1970. A Statistical Survey* (in Russian).

² *Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1970*, p. 262 (in Russian).

the Soviet orders for the construction of a large batch of ships and the purchase of forgings, aluminum cable, non-ferrous rolled stock and other goods from Egypt, the purchase of 11 million tins of meat from the Kisimayu meat packing plant in Somalia (about 80 per cent of the plant's tinned meat output), and the import of fruit preserves from Guinea.

The main trading partners of the socialist states in Africa are countries that have taken the non-capitalist road of development, the latter accounting for 80 to 90 per cent of their foreign trade turnover with socialist countries. For example, in 1970, about 82 per cent of the Soviet Union's total trade turnover with African countries involved countries with a socialist orientation. Of these, 92 per cent were in North Africa, and 15 per cent in Tropical Africa.¹ The foreign trade of the Soviet Union and other socialist states thus helps expedite the progress of countries on the non-capitalist road of development.

C) SOCIALIST INTEGRATION AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES FOR SOCIALISM

The stepping up of integration processes within the socialist system will undoubtedly promote a faster growth of its economic possibilities. According to forecasts by economists in the socialist states, by 1985, the share of the European socialist countries in world industrial production will reach 40 to 50 per cent,² and consequently their share in world trade will also increase considerably. Decisions of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance have stressed that "socialist integration is of an open character and sets no obstacles whatever to the development of economic ties between the CMEA member states and the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

"We are for the expansion of such ties because the specific features of the modern scientific and technological

¹ Based on data in *Foreign Trade of the USSR for 1970*.

² *Economic and Scientific and Technological Forecasting in the CMEA Member Countries*, Secretariat of CMEA, 1970, p. 35.

revolution make broad international cooperation necessary, and because stable and long-lasting economic ties are extremely important from the standpoint of international politics, from the standpoint of creating favourable conditions for the solution of many urgent world problems".¹

The Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Cooperation and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration, adopted in August 1971, provides for the more rapid development of the productive forces in all CMEA countries, the achievement of the highest scientific and technological level and the maximum increase in the economic effectiveness of social production. This means that in the years ahead the socialist countries will further diminish the gap that continues to exist between them and the capitalist countries in the sphere of material production. "The higher economic growth rates in the CMEA member countries as compared with those in developed capitalist countries," the Comprehensive Programme stresses, "steadily strengthen their positions in the world economy." This has a favourable effect on the newly free countries. The rapid growth rates in socialist production, the development of science and technology, the steady rise in the living standards of the peoples of the socialist countries vividly demonstrate the unquestionable advantages of the socialist economic system over the capitalist system, and, naturally, strengthen the positions of those newly independent states that have made the socialist choice and are carrying out deep-going socio-economic changes on their way to socialism. American professor Irving Horowitz acknowledges the fact that peoples of the Third World regard the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as societies that have solved the problems of economic organisation in the best possible way.²

¹ A. N. Kosygin, "The State Five-Year Plan for the Development of the Economy of the USSR for 1971-1975 and the State Plan for the Development of the Economy of the USSR for 1972". Quote from *Pravda*, November 25, 1971.

² Irving Louis Horowitz, *Three Worlds of Development. Theory and Practice of International Stratification*, New York, 1966, p. 121.

The Comprehensive Programme of socialist economic integration envisages further expansion of economic ties with the newly independent countries. The Programme notes that the socialist states will attach special importance "to further extending trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation with the developing countries".¹

The broadening and strengthening of the positions of the socialist states in world economic relations have undermined the monopoly position of the imperialist states on the world markets as suppliers of major goods, particularly goods needed for carrying out the industrialisation of the newly independent countries. As for cooperation between the Soviet Union and the developing countries, experience has shown that the economically most effective form of such cooperation, benefiting both the developing countries and the Soviet Union, is the building of enterprises whose products the national economy of the USSR can also use. To this end, definite production cooperation agreements are reached. The Soviet Union supplies complete sets of plant and machinery and renders technical assistance in building and operating new plants, and the developing countries, in turn, supply the Soviet Union with products in which it is interested. Thus, for example, in accordance with the Soviet-Guinean agreement of November 27, 1969, providing for Soviet assistance in building a Guinean state-owned bauxite mining enterprise between 1970 and 1973, of the 2,500,000 tons of bauxites mined a year the Soviet Union will receive annually 50 per cent in repayment of Soviet credits and 40 per cent—under the long-term Soviet-Guinean trade and payment agreement now in force. According to an agreement with Iraq (July 1969), in repayment of credits for the development of the state-owned oil-extracting industry, the Soviet Union will receive oil. Similar agreements have been made with Algeria (repayment of credits in the form of non-ferrous metals and oil), Egypt (oil, phosphorus,

¹ *Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Cooperation and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration by the CMEA Member Countries*, Moscow, 1971, p. 15.

aluminum) and India (rolled steel from the Bhilai steel mill).

The socialist states have already become stable volume markets for the developing countries for certain kinds of mineral raw materials. The basic raw material goods that the CMEA member states import from the developing countries are long-fibre cotton, natural rubber, jute and jute products, raw hides, citrus fruits, coffee and cocoa-beans. In recent years, the USSR has been increasing its import from these countries of natural gas, non-ferrous metal ores and rolled steel. As yet, deliveries of mineral raw materials from the developing countries to the socialist countries are not large, but there are good prospects for increasing them. This is an area for considerable growth in economic cooperation, including growth in trade between the two groups of countries.

The imperialist powers and foreign monopolies will hinder this cooperation in every way possible. It is most unlikely that foreign companies operating in the extracting industry of the developing countries will agree to ship raw materials to the socialist countries. The only partners the Soviet Union can have in this business are national, above all state-owned, enterprises and firms. The socialist countries are taking steps to broaden their economic and technical assistance to the national sector in prospecting for and organising the extraction of raw materials, including oil, iron ore, bauxites and other kinds of raw materials which the socialist countries could import.

The organisation of industrial complexes for developing mineral raw materials and fuel sources, especially in sparsely settled regions, will require huge financial outlays which could be too great for any one socialist country to handle. Therefore, the need may arise for the socialist countries to organise consortiums for the purpose of jointly financing such costly projects.

The organisation of prospecting and extracting mineral raw materials and fuel raises the question of setting up mixed companies in which economic organisations from the socialist and the developing countries would participate. A certain amount of experience along these lines

has already been accumulated. Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia have all set up a number of mixed production companies.

In contrast to foreign private direct capital investments, the formation of mixed companies with the help of the capital and experience of the socialist countries will not involve loss of ownership of or control over these companies on the part of the developing countries. The companies will be mixed only until settlement for credits and other assistance is made, or until outlays connected with plant construction and the organisation of production have been reimbursed. The socialist countries' purpose in forming mixed companies is not to acquire property or amass profits, but to find the most suitable form of assistance in building and operating enterprises whose products will also be placed on the markets of the socialist countries.

Economic and technical cooperation between the USSR and the developing countries helps to strengthen the national liberation and progressive movements and to weaken the positions of the world capitalist system in the Third World. Through cooperation with the USSR and other socialist countries and participation in the system of the socialist international division of labour, the young national states strengthen their own international and internal economic and political positions. They now have a real opportunity to wage a successful struggle against the capitalist states with the aim of changing their unequal position on the world market, securing fairer conditions of foreign trade and improving the terms on which they receive credits. Some newly independent countries restrict the activity of foreign monopolies and adopt laws banning foreign capital from key industries or establishing control over it. In some cases, enterprises belonging to foreign capital are being nationalised.

An examination of the socio-economic features of cooperation between socialist and developing countries shows that at the present time a new market is beginning to take shape in the system of world economic relations. The main specific characteristic of this market is that in the process of its formation the planned economies of the socialist countries play a major role. The elements of plan-

ning in the economies of the developing states lend stability to the new market and create even more favourable premises for deepening cooperation. The basic features of the new form of division of labour are mutual benefit, assistance given by the socialist states in overcoming the economic backwardness of the developing countries, respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, and full equality between the countries involved.

The more the economic and trade relations between socialist and developing countries develop and new forms of cooperation grow, the further will the legacy of the former international division of labour and the lopsided orientation of foreign economic ties be overcome. Such factors as growth of cooperation on the basis of long-term intergovernmental agreements, specialisation and cooperation, and joint efforts in solving major national economic problems can all result in a situation where some developing countries will be able to take part in the international socialist division of labour and in the economic organisations of the socialist countries even before they themselves have gone over to the socialist road. Participation in the new division of labour will make it possible for a number of developing countries to step up their rate of economic growth and social change and thus eliminate backwardness in a relatively short span of time.

Implementation of the Comprehensive Programme of socialist economic integration has already begun. Its significance for the newly independent countries extends beyond the sphere of economic ties. One of the goals of the Programme, as specified in the document, is to strengthen the "defence capability of the CMEA member countries". And the newly independent states, above all those with a socialist orientation, are profoundly aware that this is something that is also in their interest.

Imperialism, headed by advanced American capitalism as its shock force, uses every means and stops at no crime to retard and halt the movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America towards progress and towards socialism. The Israeli aggression against the Arabs is one of these crimes of imperialism coupled with Zionism which is trying to drown the national liberation move-

ment of the Arab peoples in blood. But imperialism has been unable to suppress this movement because of the existence and firm actions of the world socialist system.

The failure of imperialist aggression against Egypt in 1956, the frustration of the American intervention in the Lebanon in 1958 and the cessation of the colonial war in Algeria in the early 1960s—all these defeats suffered by imperialism were connected with the vigorous actions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in defence of the Arab peoples. As a consequence, imperialism and Zionism have not been in a position, as we have already stressed, to achieve their main objective—the overthrow of the progressive regimes in the Arab world.

The struggle against imperialist aggressions, the defence of the peoples' socio-economic gains, and the struggle for a just and lasting peace comprise the general direction of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist states. The 24th Congress of the CPSU made this clear in its decisions, and it is in full accordance with the vital interests of the countries of the Third World.

The world socialist system and all forces working for the revolutionary restructuring of human society now determine the main course of its development. Relying on their steadily growing economic and defence strength, the basis of which is socialist integration, the socialist countries keep the aggressive forces of imperialism in check, reducing their opportunities to export counter-revolutions and suppress national liberation movements. This helps to deepen the social revolutions that are transforming the Third World and spurring its progress.

Socialist economic integration is a revolutionary process of immense international significance. The socialist community is paving the way for all mankind to develop the material and spiritual forces of society. Defending the noble cause of peace and social progress, the fraternal socialist countries have never championed the idea of closed groupings. The Comprehensive Programme for socialist integration keeps its doors open to any state that might wish fully or partially to take part in carrying out the measures outlined in it. This offers excellent prospects for all developing states.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE FOR THE WAYS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES

One of the main features of current world history is the sharply intensified ideological struggle between socialism and imperialism. Ideological struggle has become one of the chief means by which different social classes work to realise their goals and programmes. This struggle has a direct effect on the choice made by newly independent states as to what road of social development they take; it has a direct bearing on what further change there will be in the correlation of forces between capitalism and socialism in the world.

In their efforts to fortify the positions of imperialism in Asia and Africa, imperialist ideologists and propagandists try to persuade the peoples of the newly independent countries that the capitalist way of development is best for them. At the same time, they wage a fierce struggle against the spread of Marxist-Leninist ideas and all progressive ideological trends in these countries. Some of them argue that Marxism-Leninism, having emerged on the soil of developed capitalism, is inapplicable to the conditions of Asia and Africa. Others, without coming out openly against Marxism-Leninism, try to emasculate its revolutionary content (frequently under the guise of combating dogmatism).

The main instrument of the overt enemies of communism, however, is slander of the socialist system, falsification of the policy and goals of communist parties and of the Marxist-Leninist teaching itself.

It should be noted that current within the revolutionary-democratic movement in some newly independent countries are various theories of "Left" opportunism that actually reinforce the ideological offensive of the overt foes of Marxism-Leninism.

On the whole, open rejection of Marxism and open opposition to communism have limited influence on the masses in most countries. Nonetheless, anti-communist propaganda is widespread in some countries, and in a few, anti-communism has become the official state ideology.

Very dangerous for the masses are trends in bourgeois ideology that try to "adapt" Marxism to new conditions, but in fact falsify it. Bourgeois ideologists frequently embrace the theories of Right and "Left" opportunists that have betrayed Marxism-Leninism. The struggle in both theory and practice against "Left" and Right deviations in Marxism is an extremely important and pressing problem. Actually, this struggle boils down to resolving the question of the correlation in theory and practice between the general and the particular and the ability to apply the general principles of Marxism-Leninism to concrete historical conditions.

NON-PROLETARIAN CONCEPTIONS OF SOCIALISM AND THE CONTENT OF IMPERIALISM'S IDEOLOGICAL SUBVERSION

Ideas of "national socialism" in one form or another are widespread in the newly independent countries. Objectively, these ideas reflect the protest of the working masses against capitalism and imperialism but at the same time testify to the ideological immaturity of these social forces advocating socialism.

The newly independent peoples need answers to questions about the concrete ways of achieving social and economic progress. Many eminent nationalists in the Third World show a growing interest in the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. They use separate propositions of Marxism in formulating their own conceptions of "socialism of a national type". This indicates that the political

vanguard of the national liberation revolution is coming to the conclusion that the best way to solve the problems facing the newly independent countries is through non-capitalist development.

The gravitation towards socialist slogans is one of the characteristic features of the political life of the newly independent states. These countries are attracted to the idea of socialism above all because the foremost tasks at the current state of the national liberation movement are those of socio-economic liberation, and because the application of socialist principles in the process of accomplishing these tasks shows that they meet the interests of the broad masses better than any others. The various conceptions of "national socialism" ("African" or "Arab") are embraced primarily by non-proletarian strata that spontaneously reject capitalism but have not yet mastered the scientifically grounded method of analysing historical reality. These conceptions can be either progressive or conservative in character.

Representatives of the conservative trend build their theory of modern society around assertions that it is classless, that social harmony prevails. They claim that their society can be integrated on the basis, for example, of the "exclusive qualities" of the Negro race and its "specific spiritual features". In practice, however, all attempts to find some kind of third, neutral way of socio-economic development fail: the idealisation of the socio-economic, cultural or other features of African society inevitably leads to an orientation towards the bourgeois way of development.

Characteristic of the progressive trend in "national socialism" is an intensification of anti-capitalist tendencies, tendencies towards greater approximation to scientific socialism. These tendencies manifest themselves, in particular, in a heightened interest in the ways and methods of social transformations in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. An example of this trend in the development of progressive social thought in the newly independent countries was the Arusha Declaration. While some of this programme's propositions are of a problematical character, the main thing is that ideas set forth in the

Declaration testify to a positive evolution of the ideological and political views of Julius Nyerere and those progressive forces of Tanzania that follow him. While the Tanzanian leaders previously tended to embrace notions about the classlessness of African society and the harmony of interests of all its strata, they now acknowledge the existence of class stratification and class antagonism. Nyerere pays serious attention to the materialist approach to the socio-economic and cultural development of society. On the basis of the declaration he worked out, new possibilities have opened up for bringing the official ideology of the state of Tanzania closer to scientific socialism not only in terms of criticism exposing imperialism and neo-colonialism, but, what is especially important, in terms of recognising the possibility of applying the materialist approach to such problems as those of eliminating the exploitation of man by man, establishing collective and cooperative property, recognising the decisive role of the popular masses in social development, etc.

In the face of such tendencies, the ideological apparatus of imperialism directs its basic work towards its central task, which is to undermine the African peoples' faith in socialism and belief in the need for revolutionary struggle for a new society.

With the aim of discrediting the socialist system as a whole, anti-communists play up all the negative facts they can find in the life of Soviet people, all the individual faults and shortcomings that might still crop up in socialist countries, but always in such a way as to pass off the particular for the general, the accidental for the regular. To give the illusion of being objective, they frequently resort to the device of juggling with quotations taken from Soviet publications. An analysis of anti-communist propaganda today shows that it takes the following basic directions:

— concentration by American ideologists and propagandists on criticism of the system of government in a socialist society. Imperialist propaganda lays special emphasis on its theses that one party holds a "monopoly on power" in the USSR, that "forced labour" exists there, and that

there is no "individual freedom". In recent years, imperialist propaganda has stepped up its campaign against the nationalities policy of the CPSU. While acknowledging the economic achievements of the peoples of Central Asia and Transcaucasia, the ideologists of the monopoly bourgeoisie nonetheless assert that "...the Soviet regime has far from solved the problem of minority status..." and that "The Soviet Revolution may have solved the problem of industrial growth, but it has not discovered how to foster the growth of freedom";¹

— systematic distortion and falsification of the nature and goals of Soviet foreign policy. The "arguments" used by imperialist propaganda all boil down to drawing an absurd analogy between the Soviet policy and that of tsarist Russia and making false accusations on this basis that the Soviet Union is pursuing a "neo-colonial policy" and that Soviet aid to Afro-Asian countries pursues "selfish aims". Imperialist propaganda assiduously, albeit unsuccessfully, also tries to draw an analogy between American and Soviet foreign policies. This analogy can be found, for example, in a collection of essays by West German Sovietologists entitled, *Basic Questions of Soviet Foreign Policy*, prepared by the German Society for the Study of Eastern Europe;²

— the spread of conceptions about the "convergence" of the two systems and theories about "rich" and "poor" nations, all of which hold that there is no fundamental difference between the Soviet Union and the highly developed capitalist states. The authors of such theories try to oppose the Soviet Union to the developing countries, saying that its interests as an industrial power do not coincide with the interests of the newly independent countries. For example, in *Man Against Poverty: World War III*, the well-known bourgeois writer Michael Harrington writes: "The struggle between East and West, communism and capitalism ... could now come to an end—and be re-

¹ Alex Inkeles, *Social Change in Soviet Russia*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, pp. 244, 60.

² Boris Meissner und Gotthold Rhode (Hrsg), *Grundfragen sowjetischer Außenpolitik...*, Stuttgart, Kolhammer, 1970, S. 7.

placed by this conflict between the North, both Communist and capitalist, and the South, which is poor."¹

There is little need to point out the obvious absurdity of such "geographical" arguments;

— the use in the fight against socialism of reactionary features of nationalism and the encouragement of chauvinism and separatism. In this struggle, imperialism puts its stake first and foremost on the national bourgeoisie, which it tries to frighten by harping on the threat of the nationalisation of private property, the collectivisation of agriculture, etc.

Nationalism grows primarily in economically backward countries. In his Draft Theses on National and Colonial Question which he prepared for the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin wrote: "...The more backward the country, the stronger is the hold of small-scale agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation, which inevitably lend particular strength and tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i.e., to national egoism and national narrow-mindedness. These prejudices are bound to die out very slowly, for they can disappear only after imperialism and capitalism have disappeared in the advanced countries, and after the entire foundation of the backward countries' economic life has radically changed."² The ideologists of imperialism spread the idea of an alliance between capitalism and nationalism in the newly independent states. The last five years have shown that in some developing countries Right-wing nationalistic elements are succeeding, with the support of imperialist forces, in establishing undemocratic regimes and hampering the struggle of the peoples for non-capitalist development and for socialism.

THE HEGEMONIC NATURE OF MAOISM

Serious damage is being inflicted upon the national liberation movement and the struggle for socialism in the coun-

¹ *Man Against Poverty: World War III*, edited by Arthur Braustein and Roger Woock, New York, 1968, p. 23.

² V. I. Lenin, "Draft Theses on National and Colonial Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 34, p. 450.

tries of the Third World by the great-power course taken by the Mao Tse-tung group in China. In Chapter 1, we mentioned that the Maoists attack the non-capitalist way of development. The Maoist press, for example, condemned candidate member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Hu Chiao-mu simply because he quoted Lenin's theoretical proposition that backward countries could possibly by-pass the capitalist stage of development.

Since the Maoists have proclaimed their own "special" platform with respect to the national liberation movement and speculate heavily on the fact that China was under foreign control in the past, let us examine this platform and the Maoists' practical activity as applied, in particular, to Africa. The facts show that this splitting activity has inflicted great damage to the national liberation struggle of the African peoples. But how exactly is the anti-Marxist essence of the Maoist platform expressed, and why is it so dangerous to the struggle of the peoples of the newly independent countries for socialism?

Everyone knows that the national liberation movement has scored striking successes in the postwar years. In this extremely short historical period, most of the peoples of Asia and Africa have thrown off the colonial yoke: about 80 countries and peoples formerly under imperialist domination have stepped out onto the road of independent development.

These successes became possible because of the military and political defeat of fascist Germany and militaristic Japan in the Second World War, the decisive contribution to which was made by the Soviet Union, and as a consequence of the serious weakening of the colonial metropolises—Britain, France, Belgium and Holland—as a result of the emergence and consolidation of the world socialist system.

To be sure, the struggle of the colonial peoples for national independence is above all the result of the efforts of these peoples themselves. But imperialism is still a powerful international force, and struggle with it requires the international efforts and unity of all the revolutionary forces of our time. The anti-colonial and anti-imperialist

policy and growing strength of the Soviet Union and other socialist states have created favourable conditions for the successful development of the national liberation movement. There is, perhaps, not a single country in Asia and Africa that has not made use of these conditions and has not at the same time received to one extent or another the support of the Soviet Union in its struggle against imperialism and colonialism. This is an irrefutable historical fact.

An outstanding historical event in the postwar period was the victory of the Chinese people—the victory of the Chinese revolution. The USSR rendered the Chinese fighters the most diverse assistance, including sizeable deliveries of military supplies and other equipment. After the defeat of the Kwantung army in Manchuria in 1945, a large part of the Soviet arms and military equipment was given over to the People's Liberation Army, which was under the command of the Chinese Communists. This act was a vivid demonstration of the Soviet Union's class and internationalist policy. When the United States and other imperialist powers took sides with Chinese reaction and supplied arms to the armies of Chiang Kai-shek, the USSR was rendering all-round assistance to the revolutionary forces of China. Mao Tse-tung acknowledged the fact that "from the very beginning of the war of resistance, not a single government of any imperialist power gave us any real assistance. Only the Soviet Union gave us help with human, material and financial resources on a large scale." The liberation forces in Korea and Vietnam received the same kind of assistance from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union regards aid to progressive liberation forces in Asia and Africa as its internationalist duty.

After Asia, the national liberation movement embraced Africa. The external factors that predetermined its upswing on the African continent were the same: the blood spilled by millions of Soviet people on the fields of battle with the fascist hordes, the great sacrifices that were made by the Soviet people in the name of peace and the freedom and progress of all nations.

After the Second World War, imperialism made an all-out effort to save the colonial system. The colonialists tried

to suppress the national liberation movement by force of arms. In Algeria in 1945, and in Madagascar in 1947, the French colonial forces killed thousands of peaceful inhabitants who had demanded that their right to independence be realised. The British imperialists tried by force of arms to block the national liberation movement in Kenya and other British colonies in Africa. The imperialists united in the fight against the national liberation movement.

In that difficult period of the struggle for independence, the Soviet Union made a decisive stand on the side of the African peoples. On behalf of world socialism it carried out its internationalist duty virtually alone, since the other socialist countries were then only in the process of formation and their possibilities were limited. The Chinese People's Republic, whose revolution had won out in 1949, was busy with its own internal problems and itself had need of broad support from the Soviet Union. During that period, despite the economic hardships evoked by the war, the USSR rendered aid to other revolutionary movements, including the national liberation movement in Africa.

The Soviet Union used its prestige in the United Nations to frustrate imperialist plans aimed at preserving colonial domination in Africa. In 1946 and 1947, the USSR actively supported the demands of the peoples of Egypt and Sudan for the withdrawal of British forces from their territories. In 1949-51, the USSR actively supported the just demands of the Libyan people for independence. In 1952-54, the USSR came out in the United Nations in favour of granting independence to Tunisia, Morocco, South-West Africa and other colonial peoples.

When the armed struggle for the national liberation of the African peoples began, the Soviet Union stood firmly on the side of the national liberation forces. It rendered aid to the Algerian fighters for independence and to the forces of the national liberation movements in Kenya, Mali, Guinea and other countries. In 1956, the position taken by the USSR was the decisive factor in stopping the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt. Recalling that time, Gamal Abdel Nasser said: "We will

never forget the support of the Soviet Union in those difficult days. We will never forget its help, based on high ideals and principles."

By 1962, most African countries had won their political independence. For most of the African peoples, the period of their national liberation struggle could be considered as having ended. It was a period that began and ended virtually without the participation of China in the revolutionary struggle of the Africans.

China began to pursue an active policy in Africa when everywhere on that continent, except in the south, the first stage of the struggle against colonialism had actually drawn to a close, when the tasks facing the peoples of Africa were now those of eliminating economic backwardness and choosing the road they would take in their socio-political development. With the aim of enhancing Chinese influence on the course of events in Africa, Chou En-lai made his first visit to the continent in late 1963 and early 1964, during which time he loudly proclaimed China's desire to give disinterested support to the African peoples in their struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

The independent countries of Africa sincerely welcomed the entrance of the Chinese People's Republic into the international arena and felt that this would strengthen the anti-imperialist front and facilitate their fight for freedom and the consolidation of their independence. But it soon became clear that the Peking leaders were pursuing other aims in Africa. Having by that time already failed in an attempt to split the socialist camp and the world communist movement, the Maoist leaders of the Chinese People's Republic decided on a course aimed at undermining the prestige and influence of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries among the peoples of the developing countries. Basing its policy on great-power chauvinism and hegemony but veiling it with loud revolutionary phrases, Peking in the first half of the 1960s launched a broad campaign of subversive activity aimed at inducing the independent African countries and the forces of the national liberation movement to break with their international alliance with the Soviet Union and world socialism and bringing these countries and revolu-

tionary movements under Peking's control. The chief means for achieving these ends was blatant anti-Sovietism—slander of the Soviet socialist system and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

Camouflaged with pseudo-Marxist terminology, this Maoist policy inflicted serious damage to the unity and solidarity of the African peoples in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism. Absolutisation of the experience of the Chinese revolution and the foisting upon all revolutionary forces of the African continent the theory and practice of "people's warfare" without taking the concrete situation and real possibilities into account; the formation of pro-Chinese groupings within the African communist and national liberation movements; gross interference in the internal affairs of the African countries with the aim of overthrowing legitimate governments that had rejected the Maoists' overtures—these were the earmarks of the Maoist policy in the African countries.

In the period of 1961-65, the Peking Maoists were largely instrumental in the breakdown and splitting of such patriotic, revolutionary democratic parties as the People's Union of Cameroon, the Sawaba Party in Niger and the national liberation movement in Zaire. They were responsible for the weakening of the African Independence Party of Senegal and the split in the national liberation movements in Rhodesia and South-West Africa. They also inflicted great harm to the liberation struggle in the Portuguese colonies and to the communist movement in the south of Africa. The chairman of the South Africa Communist Party, John B. Marks, said at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that the actions of the leaders of the Communist Party of China "impinge on our struggle against imperialism" and "so far from advancing that struggle positively impede it and are in practice aiding and abetting the enemy".

The Chinese tactic of "instigating" revolutions, for example—a tactic that has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism, which thoroughly rejects the theory of "exporting" revolutions—suited the imperialists very well. They took advantage of this adventurist course taken by the Maoists in the African countries to the utmost; it gave

them a pretext for interference in the internal affairs of these countries, for putting economic, political and diplomatic pressure on Africa and strengthening their neo-colonialist positions there. At the time, the Chinese leadership was busy spreading the incendiary thesis that imperialism was a "paper tiger". But the course taken by the Chinese splitters boomeranged. A number of African states broke off diplomatic relations with Peking in the mid-1960s, the adventurist policy of the Maoists was exposed by progressive circles in Africa, China's prestige in the eyes of the African peoples fell, and China faced the threat of isolation. It was during this period of serious defeats for the Maoist policy in Africa that China quit the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation. The Maoists' adventurism in Africa cost the national liberation movement dearly: thousands of freedom fighters perished and a number of patriotic organisations were smashed by the forces of reaction.

During the "cultural revolution" (1966-69), the Maoist leaders of the Chinese People's Republic gave no assistance at all to the national liberation movement in Africa, not even moral support for those who had become the victims of their splitting and adventurist policy.

In 1970 and 1971, having strengthened their positions within their own country, Mao Tse-tung and his group renewed their activity on the international scene, Africa included. Still bent on achieving their hegemonic and great-power aims there, the Maoists did, however, make substantial modifications in their tactics with respect to the independent African countries and peoples waging a struggle for freedom and independence.

By 1972, China had established diplomatic relations with 18 African states. At present, Peking is trying to characterise its foreign policy as being exclusively permeated with deep concern for the progress of the African peoples. To get Africans to believe this, the Chinese leadership offers some African countries economic assistance on highly favourable terms.

In an effort to end the isolation in which the Chinese People's Republic found itself as a result of the Maoist "cultural revolution", the leaders of the CPR have chosen

the tactic of establishing closer ties with national liberation movements in Africa. Peking spares no effort or means to engender African distrust of the Soviet Union and its peaceful foreign policy. The "new course" in Maoist diplomacy in Africa is pursued under the false pretext of China's struggle against the influence of the "two super-powers", into which struggle the Maoists are trying to draw Africans. However, if the Chinese leaders' policies towards the United States and towards the Soviet Union are compared, it becomes clear that they are waging a struggle only against the USSR and other socialist countries. The coincidence of the positions of the United States and China in the Indo-Pakistan conflict and on the question of holding a world conference on disarmament, the Maoists' growing secret economic cooperation with the racist regimes in South Africa, their betrayal of the interests of various African groups waging a liberation struggle—these and other facts indicate that the Maoist leadership is becoming an accomplice of international imperialism in fighting the national liberation movement. In 1971, during the tragic events in Sudan that were provoked by foreign intelligence services and above all the CIA, China sided with imperialist reaction and betrayed the Sudanese Communists. With their unrestrained slander of the Soviet Union, the Maoists try to denigrate the great cause of communist construction in the Soviet Union and socialist construction in other socialist countries. The anti-Sovietism of Chinese social-chauvinists has gone as far as saying that the Soviet Union "considers it its duty to suppress the revolution of the peoples of the world and rabidly subverts the revolutionary struggle of the African peoples in a vain effort to extinguish the flame of revolution on this continent".¹

The anti-Sovietists from Peking were not even ruffled by the commonly known fact that the patriots of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau received substantial and all-round Soviet aid in their heroic fight against the colonialists. The USSR sent medical supplies, vehicles and machinery, food and other prime necessities to the liberated

¹ *Jen-min jih-pao*, March 15, 1969.

areas. In his address at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, General Secretary of the African Party of the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde Amilcar Cabral stated: "We are not belittling the significance of African solidarity and the solidarity of other anti-colonial forces in the world when we frankly state that it is from the Soviet Union that we receive the greatest assistance in our struggle."

Behind the camouflage of artificially contrived theories about "two super-powers" and "rich" and "poor" nations, the Maoists strive to isolate the young African states from the socialist camp, to split and weaken the anti-imperialist alliance of the forces of world socialism, the national liberation movement and the international workers' movement, which has frequently demonstrated its potency in the struggle against imperialism and in defending peace and the progress of peoples. But what would it mean to tear the national liberation movement away from world socialism? It would mean disuniting two revolutionary currents that have a common enemy—imperialism. It would mean acting contrary to one of the fundamental guidelines set by Lenin when he spoke of the need to unite the socialist revolution and the national liberation movement. In practice, such a separation would mean that the national liberation movement would be left to face imperialism alone.

The subversive activities of the Chinese splitters in the national liberation movement impede the latter from developing into a socialist revolution. Peking does everything possible to counter the merger of all the anti-imperialist forces on the continent into a single anti-imperialist front. It endeavours to undermine the growing friendship and cooperation between the African countries, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and other socialist states, on the other, yet it is precisely this friendship and cooperation that act as a powerful impetus to Africa's movement along the road of progress. For the Peking splitters, however, the slogan of friendship and cooperation with developing countries is nothing more than a way to achieve their hegemonic goals in the international arena. Speaking at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties about the anti-Marxist nature of Mao Tse-tung's

ideas, which the Maoists hail as the acme of Marxist thought, Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party Waldeck Rochet said: "The Left-wing deviation, which is characteristic of the groupings belonging to Maoism or Trotskyism, is wishful thinking which turns impatience into a strategy. It denies the connection between economic and political struggle, between the struggle for democracy and for socialism. It opposes the alliance between the working class and other social groups suffering from big capital. It makes up to young people in an effort to convince them, as Trotsky tried to do, that young people are the salt of the earth, and tries to substitute a so-called conflict of generations for the struggle of classes. The Left deviation does not aim its main blows at the bourgeoisie but at the proletarian party, the Communist Party, setting petty-bourgeois anarchism against the Party's organisation based on democratic centralism."¹

In conducting their subversive activity, the Peking Maoists bank on nationalist extremist elements and racial prejudices. Sometimes they succeed in concealing the real aims of their policy with expatiations about the "common fate" of the Chinese people and the peoples of Asia and Africa. Thus, for example, under the influence of their propaganda, some revolutionarily minded petty-bourgeois figures in Algeria and other countries with a socialist orientation have made statements to the effect that the nuclear armament of the CPR is a "factor strengthening peace".

The people making such statements do not see the danger that the militarisation of China and the efforts of its ruling circles to realise their great-power ambitions pose to the entire national liberation movement.

The anti-Leninist line that calls for jumping over necessary and inevitable stages of revolutionary change on the way to socialism, malicious anti-Sovietism and attempts to undermine the growing equitable cooperation between the Soviet Union and the newly independent countries—

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 116.

all this is detrimental to the development of the socialist orientation in Asia and Africa and only promotes the extension of neo-colonialist control by the imperialist powers.

MARXIST-LENINIST ASSESSMENT OF THE NON-PROLETARIAN CONCEPTIONS OF SOCIALISM. THE BRILLIANT EXAMPLE OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE VIEWS OF GAMAL ABDEL NASSER

Maoism is especially dangerous to newly independent countries where a sharp ideological struggle is in progress to determine which way of development will be chosen, in the course of which struggle the views of revolutionary democrats usually go through a process of evolution. Marxists-Leninists approach non-proletarian conceptions of socialism dialectically. Lenin gave a brilliant example of such an approach in his work, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", where he examined and assessed Russian Narodism as a system of views of petty-bourgeois peasant democracy in Russia. He outlined a number of requirements that should be met whenever any ideology, including the ideology of non-proletarian socialism, is analysed and weighed.

First requirement. The materialist understanding of history proceeds from the proposition that before man engages in any kind of mental activity—philosophy, politics, science, religion—he must eat, drink, have clothing, build shelter, that is, before he thinks and in order for him to think, man must produce material wealth. Hence, the means of producing material wealth is the basis of the life and development of human society. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their social being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. Therefore, the source of change in and development of social consciousness must be sought not in the consciousness itself, not in ideas themselves, but in social being. In this sense, Lenin demanded "that social ideas be reduced to social-economic relations", stressing

that "...unless this is done it is impossible to understand even the purely theoretical ideas of Narodism..."¹

Second requirement. Keeping in mind that the most concentrated expression of economics is politics, that is, primarily relations between classes, Lenin strongly rejected any abstract, idealistic, non-class approach to ideology: "Narodnik ideas in general," he wrote, "are the result of their reflecting the interests and viewpoint of the small producer, and not at all the result of 'pure' thought."²

Lenin emphasised that in order to properly analyse an ideology it is absolutely necessary first to analyse the objective position in society of the class whose interests that ideology expresses and defends. He established the fact that the essence of Narodism consisted in its reflecting the interests of producers from the point of view of the small producer, the petty bourgeois; the source of Narodism was in the predominance of the class of small producers in post-Reform capitalist Russia.³

Third requirement. This is the obligation of a Marxist to approach this class not only from the standpoint of what it is today, but also from the point of view of what it will be tomorrow, to reveal its present and foresee its future contradictions and take them into account in ideology.

The carrier of the Narodnik ideology, the small producer, is, as Lenin pointed out, a progressive element to the extent that he begins to "differentiate from society", and a reactionary element inasmuch as he fights to preserve his position as a small proprietor and strives to retard economic development. "That is why Russian Narodism, too," stressed Lenin, "is able to combine progressive, democratic features in its doctrine with the reactionary features...."⁴

Fourth requirement. An ideology must not be examined metaphysically as something given and immutable, but dialectically, that is, from the standpoint of its actual or

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 397.

² *Ibid.*, p. 362.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 396.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 402.

possible evolution, which depends on the evolution of economic and class relations. When the prominent ideologist of so-called "legal Marxism" in Russia, Pyotr Struve, called Narodism "national socialism", Lenin made a fundamentally important remark: "Instead of 'national' he should have said 'peasant' in reference to the old Russian Narodism..."—the Narodism of the 1860s and 1870s, when capitalism was only taking its first steps in Russia, when the petty-bourgeois character of peasant farming had not yet revealed itself, and when the Narodniks "went among the people" and Narodism was revolutionary.¹

Thus, Lenin rejected the concept of "national socialism" and spoke, rather, of *class* socialism—"peasant" or "petty-bourgeois" socialism. This contradiction in the ideology of Narodism—the presence of both progressive and reactionary features, with first one and then the other becoming stronger—determined, according to Lenin, the possibility of its transition either to proletarian socialism or to bourgeois liberalism.²

The *fifth requirement* was most clearly formulated in an article entitled "The 'Leftward Swing' of the Bourgeoisie and the Tasks of the Proletariat", which Lenin wrote in 1909 after the first Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution and on the basis of its experience. At that time, the Mensheviks, trying to prevent an alliance between the leader of this revolution—the proletariat—and the democratic masses of working peasants and to foist the leadership of the bourgeoisie on the latter, maintained that these masses were full of petty-bourgeois utopias, that their struggle for land took place under preposterous and reactionary slogans calling for socialisation of the land or equalised land tenure, and that, therefore, their struggle weakened the revolution and their victory would be a reactionary victory of town over country. "Such an estimate of the Trudovik peasantry," Lenin said, "is just as outrageous a distortion of Marxism.... It is doctrinairism at its worst when a Marxist is unable to grasp the *actual* signi-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 396.

² *Ibid.*

ficance of a revolutionary struggle against the whole system of contemporary landed proprietorship, under the integument of a Narodnik *doctrine* which really is absurd, visionary and reactionary when viewed as a socialist doctrine."¹

Lenin did not treat the utopian-socialist Narodnik ideology as a purely Russian phenomenon, but understood it as an inevitable *international* development. In "Democracy and Narodism in China", written in 1912, he examined "the relations between democracy and Narodism in modern bourgeois revolutions in Asia".² He felt that Narodism was characteristic of China in the days of Sun Yat-sen and that it would become typical of any other country, above all in the East. One characteristic example that confirms the correctness of this idea was the evolution of the views of Gamal Abdel Nasser.

The emergence of the world system of socialism, the upswing in the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries, and the gathering momentum of the national liberation struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies in the late 1940s and early 1950s had a tremendous impact on the internal political situation in Egypt. Under the direct influence of the spectacular successes of the world progressive forces, the prerequisites were being created for those who would soon head the Egyptian revolution to develop new views and to make a stand for national liberation.

The Arab Republic of Egypt occupies a special place among the developing countries of the East that have embarked on the road of progressive development and have proclaimed the building of a socialist society as the general goal of all deep-going socio-economic changes. It was the first among the countries of the Middle East and Africa to break off the chains of colonialism. The victory on July 23, 1952, of the national revolutionary forces, headed by Nasser, marked the beginning of an anti-im-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The 'Leftward Swing' of the Bourgeoisie and the Tasks of the Proletariat", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, pp.400-01.

² V. I. Lenin, "Democracy and Narodism in China", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 163.

perialist, anti-feudal revolution that was to affect every aspect of the life of the people of this Arab country. The agrarian reform promulgated on September 9, 1952, became the first important revolutionary act of the newly created government of Egypt. It was a blow both to the semi-feudal landowners and the big Egyptian capitalists who had grown up on trade in and the processing of cotton and gotten fat on the sweat and blood of the Egyptian fellahs.

The September 1954 Anglo-Egyptian agreement on the withdrawal of British forces from Egypt laid the foundation for the liberation of the country from foreign dominance. The agreement carried the signature of Nasser, who fought indefatigably against the intrigues of the imperialist forces in the Middle East. His actions against the Baghdad Pact and other political and aggressive plans of the West have gone down in history as an example of genuine service to one's country and the cause of its liberation. Nasser correctly understood one of the most important features of the times—the common interests of the developing countries and the socialist states.

As early as 1955 he was keenly aware that reliance on the world socialist community, which stood at the head of the world revolutionary forces, was vitally important to the Egyptian revolution and for the renaissance of the Arab nation in general. At that time, the Egyptian people delivered a challenge to the policy of blocs and aggressive pacts. Refusing to go along with the imperialist policy of the United States and Britain, Egypt rejected the West's proposal to take part in a system of the so-called "common defence of the Middle East".

As the embodiment of the Egyptian people's national dignity and Egypt's independent political course, President Nasser became hated by the imperialists. The drawing together of Egypt and the Soviet Union and Egypt's entrance into the international arena as a country fighting colonialism and neo-colonialism enhanced her revolutionary role in the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples. Nasser did much to strengthen Afro-Asian solidarity on an anti-imperialist basis. His trip to Bandung in 1955 was of special significance in this respect. The positive role played by the Egyptian delegation at the first Afro-

Asian conference contributed to the formation of an anti-imperialist front of Afro-Asian countries.

In July 1956, the United States and Britain refused to grant Egypt a loan for building the first section of the High Aswan Dam, hoping thereby to force Egypt to turn off the road she had chosen. In response to this provocative pressure from the imperialist powers, Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal Company. To this legitimate action taken by the Egyptian Government, Israel, Britain and France reacted with "triple" aggression. At that difficult time for Egypt, the USSR and other socialist countries took firm action in support of the just cause of the Egyptian people.

In 1960, the major banks of the country were placed in the hands of the Egyptian state, and 1961 saw the beginning of complete or partial nationalisation of factories, insurance companies and many industrial and other companies that belonged to the big and middle Egyptian bourgeoisie.

The Egyptisation of foreign companies and the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company helped break the dominance of foreign capital in Egypt and made it possible to establish the state sector in industry—the basis for the country's planned economic development. In the period of 1961-65, the people of Egypt, under the leadership of President Nasser, responded to the sabotage by the comprador bourgeoisie by nationalising the property of the big bourgeoisie and partially nationalising the property of the middle bourgeoisie. At the same time, deep-going social changes in other spheres of Egyptian life began to be carried out.

Having adopted the Charter of National Action (1962) and having created the Arab Socialist Union—the basis for a common front of workers, fellahs, democratic intellectuals and other patriotic strata—Egypt embarked upon a socialist oriented road, thus opening up prospects for the building of a socialist society.

By the time of the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries (June 1967), Egypt, under Nasser's leadership, had scored significant successes in developing her national industry (the volume of industrial production had gone up

400 per cent in comparison with 1952), agriculture and culture. With the help of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, Egypt had begun to set up new important branches of the economy and to establish the basis for the country's electrification, namely, the Aswan hydroengineering complex. Simultaneously, the industrial proletariat was growing both numerically and ideologically, a course towards organising the peasantry into cooperatives was being pursued, free education was introduced and the doors to educational establishments were flung open to the children of working people. Under Nasser's leadership, the Arab Socialist Union was developing more and more into a mass political organisation of all Egyptian progressive forces and began to show a growing interest in the experience of socialist construction in the USSR.

The progressive socio-economic transformations in Egypt took place under conditions of intense internal class struggle and economic, political and ideological attacks by the forces of imperialism and Zionism, who sought support from among the reactionary forces within the country. International imperialism continued to nourish hopes of altering Egypt's course and of removing Nasser from the political scene, the man who for the broad masses of Arab working people was the symbol of their social, anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolution. Imperialism embarked on open aggression against the Arab countries, hoping thereby to eliminate Nasser, abolish the progressive regime of the Arab Republic of Egypt and strike a blow to the entire national liberation movement.

The Israeli aggression of 1967 created great political and economic hardships for the Arab Republic of Egypt. It led to an aggravation of the internal political situation, and triggered new intrigues by reactionary elements who demanded encouragement of the private sector to the detriment of the state sector and a halt to social changes.

At that difficult moment for Egypt and for all Arab peoples, Nasser assumed the tremendous historical responsibility for the fate of his country and headed the Arab resistance to the imperialist aggression. In that period, Nasser became the leader of the masses. He did not aban-

don revolutionary policy; on the contrary, he steered a course towards deepening it.

The masses of Egyptian working people—the workers, the fellahs and the democratic intelligentsia—actively supported the programme proposed by Nasser on March 30, 1969. It was a programme aimed at deepening the socio-economic changes begun, further democratising the social and political life of the country, reorganising the Arab Socialist Union and the trade unions from top to bottom on an elective basis, and strengthening the defence capability of the Arab Republic of Egypt. In working on the Charter of National Action and the Programme of March 30, 1969, Nasser adopted a number of fundamental propositions of scientific socialism and strove to create on the basis of the Arab Socialist Union the core of a revolutionary-democratic party.

Nasser was not only a revolutionist and prominent statesman; he was an outstanding theorist of the national liberation anti-imperialist revolution. In his revolutionary transformations of the country he always turned to the masses of working people, to the working class and the peasantry, and strove to rely on the revolutionary initiative of the masses. In his speeches he always stressed the need for reliance on the masses and the creation of a vanguard revolutionary party. "If we want the revolution to continue, we must create a political organisation within the ASU, for leaders, like all individuals, are not eternal; we need a strong political organisation that can continue to apply the principles of the revolution."¹

Nasser was a strong advocate of uniting all the revolutionary forces in the country, from the Communists to the revolutionary democrats. This accounts for the great successes of the Egyptian revolution, which had united the people in the face of harsh ordeals. "We need political organisation," he said, "to overcome the forces of organised reaction which resists any continuation of the revolutionary initiative in socialist construction."² In a speech

¹ *Al Katib*, December 1970, p. 44.

² *Ibid.*, p. 54.

at the opening of the National Assembly on December 12, 1964, Nasser, emphasising the role of the popular masses in carrying out social transformations at the stage of non-capitalist development, said: "We cannot automatically switch from exploitative capitalism and feudalism to socialism. Socialism means the people's control over the means of production. Socialism means placing the means of production at the service of the people. It is impossible to go from a society of exploitative capitalism and feudalism to a socialist society unless the masses of working people are politically active, unless the working class and the fellahs wage a struggle to seize the power that is in the hands of reaction and use this power for making radical social changes in the country."¹

Having overcome certain ideological vacillations experienced at the first stage of the revolution, Nasser became a consistent fighter for the socialist orientation. He refuted all kinds of false interpretations of what the term "socialist orientation" meant and made it clear that no matter what way is adopted to achieve socialism with account taken of the concrete conditions in the country, the main and fundamental content of socialism, its scientific character, must not be rejected. In a speech on August 8, 1966, he said: "Socialism means the abolition of the exploitation of man by man. The road to socialism may be different in different countries.... There are people who like to call our socialism Arab socialism, with its own specific nature. I believe that it can only be a question of the Arab application of socialism, and not one of Arab socialism. I believe that there is only one socialism, which has a single set of general basic principles."²

Developing this idea in other speeches, Nasser said that "socialism means liberating man from economic exploitation and social oppression", that it means the "rule of the people over the means of production", and that "we are for socialist democracy, for democracy of the working people, which means the abolition of feudalism, the monopolies, and the dominance of capital".³

¹ *Al Ahram*, December 13, 1964.

² *Al Katib*, November 1966, p. 165.

³ *Ibid.*

From the speeches made by Nasser in 1961-62, which marked the turn towards socialist transformations, it was already clear that he had taken cognisance of the former errors of the Egyptian revolutionary leadership and flatly rejected the possibility of any alliance with the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie in the struggle against external reaction. "It is time," he said, "for us frankly and boldly to acknowledge our errors in thinking that we could wage a successful struggle against imperialism and the Zionist Israeli danger without eliminating internal reaction in the Arab countries.... We must admit that we were wrong in entering into conciliation with internal reaction, which turned out to be the main support of imperialism. We have so far been struggling against imperialism and its bases, when all the while it was being supported within our country by internal reaction, which had erected palaces by exploiting the people. Reaction relies on imperialism to protect its palaces from the people. It is time we struck at these fortresses of reaction, at the multimillionaire moneybags—the main pillars of imperialism; it is time to cast out the delusion that class contradictions can be resolved by peaceful means within the framework of national unity. Reaction, opportunism, capitalism and feudalism are in the same bloc with imperialism. We must first clean our house of reaction. We need an alliance of the workers with the fellahs, the intelligentsia, with the army and with the national bourgeoisie."¹

In the fight against imperialism and internal reaction and the struggle for the socialist orientation and anti-imperialist Arab unity, Nasser relied not only on the support of the working people of his country, but also on friendship with the countries of socialism, headed by the Soviet Union. His behest was to strengthen this unity and to regard friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union as the strategic line of the Arab Republic of Egypt's foreign policy.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries always supported Nasser's policy of consistently strengthening Egypt's national independence and enhancing her

¹ *Al Katib*, November 1970, p. 168.

role in the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

Soviet-Egyptian friendship emerged, grew and was tempered in the sharp and unrelenting struggle against the mounting onslaught of imperialism, Zionism and internal reaction. The history of Soviet-Egyptian relations provides irrefutable evidence of this. In October-November 1956, when Egypt became the victim of imperialist aggression by three states, the Soviet Union, true to the Leninist principles of its foreign policy and responding to the call of the Egyptian Government, took firm action to help the Arab people stop the aggression. As Nasser himself mentioned many times, the firm support given by the Soviet Union to republican Egypt was instrumental in the failure of the "triple" aggression and in aborting the criminal plans of world imperialism in the Middle East.

President Nasser's farsighted and realistic course towards strengthening the alliance of the Egyptian revolution and world socialism was again put to a harsh test during and after Israel's aggression against the Arab states in June 1967. The Soviet Union's firm position in the Security Council in calling for an immediate ceasefire on all fronts was instrumental in bringing Israel's aggression to a halt. Talks between Soviet and Arab leaders were helpful in working out coordinated steps aimed at increasing the defence capabilities of Egypt and other Arab states and strengthening the rebuff to Israeli aggression. In June 1967, a plenum of the CC CPSU adopted an extensive decision regarding urgent foreign policy measures to be taken by the Soviet state in connection with Israel's aggressive actions. After that, at the initiative of the CC CPSU, meetings of the leaders of Communist and Workers' Parties were held in Moscow and Budapest in June and July 1967, at which a common line for the struggle against Israel's aggression and the elimination of its dangerous consequences was worked out.

The vigorous foreign policy actions of the Soviet Union and other socialist states frustrated imperialist plans to undermine and eradicate progressive revolutionary-democratic regimes in the Arab East. Soviet-Arab friend-

ship became the decisive political factor in the Middle East.

Nasser played a big role in developing Soviet-Egyptian economic, scientific and technical cooperation, which contributed to the success of Egypt's industrialisation and her transformation from a backward agrarian country into an agrarian-industrial country. Pointing out the great importance that economic cooperation with the USSR had for Egypt's national renaissance, Nasser laid special emphasis on its genuinely equal and fraternal character. The Soviet Union, the President stressed, does not lay down any conditions to Egypt and does not engage in any kind of interference in the internal affairs of the Egyptian state.

Giving expression to the progressive revolutionary-democratic aspirations of the broad popular masses, Nasser did much to unite the progressive forces of Egypt. These forces, in turn, gave their full support to all the far-reaching socio-economic changes carried out under the leadership of their President. Nasser understood that the stronger the unity and solidarity of all the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces supported by world socialism and the world revolutionary movement were, the more successful the Egyptian national liberation revolution and the stronger Egypt's independence would be.

Nasser knew how to combine national and international interests in the anti-imperialist struggle; he knew how to reveal in full not only the purely "regional" significance of Arab-Soviet cooperation, but also its permanent world importance. He expressed these thoughts during his last visit to the USSR in the summer of 1970, not long before his premature death. "Arab-Soviet friendship," he said, "is not a temporary phenomenon for our peoples. It has become a permanent factor whose influence extends to the struggle for freedom and peace. It is reinforced by mutual trust, which stems from a profound understanding of the problems of the struggle that both sides are waging."

Nasser's ideas found their embodiment in the Soviet-Egyptian Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation signed in Cairo in May 1971. This treaty, which flows logically and naturally from the Soviet Union's Leninist foreign policy

course and progressive anti-imperialist policy, substantially strengthens the international positions of the Arab Republic of Egypt and, consequently, of the whole Arab national liberation front in the struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction. Soviet-Egyptian cooperation was placed on a stable, reliable and lasting foundation.

Gamal Abdel Nasser's legacy, his progressive revolutionary-democratic principles, his noble creative work, his outstanding contribution to the strengthening of Soviet-Arab friendship and cooperation—all this constitutes invaluable political capital for the people of the Arab Republic of Egypt as it works to realise its cherished desire to create a society without national oppression and social exploitation.

From the overall analysis contained in our book a definite idea of the essence of the non-capitalist way of development can be formed.

In the *economic* sphere it is characterised by an attack on the positions of big and medium foreign and local capital; the nationalisation of the basic means of production and the creation of the state sector; and the carrying out of radical agrarian reforms on the basis of abolishing landlord property rights, allocating land to the peasants and organising cooperatives.

In the *social* sphere, the non-capitalist way entails the limitation of exploitation; the emergence and development of production relations based on state-owned and cooperative forms of property; a change in the class structure of society in the interests of the working people and to the detriment of the exploiters; and a rise in the living standard and culture of the workers and peasants.

In the *political* sphere, the non-capitalist way creates conditions in which the working people are directly involved in the establishment and development of national statehood and the unification of all progressive forces, and it determines the gravitation of the newly independent countries towards the socialist countries and of the revolutionary democratic parties and organisations to the Communist and Workers' Parties of the world.

In the sphere of *ideology*, non-capitalist development furthers the differentiation of the newly independent coun-

tries' current socialist doctrines, strengthening their tendency towards closer approximation to scientific socialism.

Thus, *the non-capitalist way is a form of approach and ultimately of transition to socialism, the connecting link between national liberation revolution and socialist revolution.*

On the basis of the material presented in the book, we may also ascertain laws and specific features of non-capitalist development. Firstly, development along the non-capitalist lines is directed towards an ultimate goal, which is to build a socialist society.

Secondly, it is a matter of so-called transitional relations, that is, of revolutionary transformations on the way to socialism.

Thirdly, non-capitalist development proceeds under the leadership of the most progressive and the most revolutionary forces in the country at the given stage of its development. State power is of a broad democratic character; it has the support of the working people and expresses their interests.

Fourthly, some of the ways and means used for transforming the economy in the process of non-capitalist development are similar to ways and means used in the transition from capitalism to socialism. These include nationalisation, the expansion and strengthening of the state sector, and a policy of limiting and controlling the private capitalist sector and restricting the opportunities for that sector to develop to the detriment of the public interest and thus preventing it from occupying a dominant position in the economy.

Fifthly, the cultural policy of the countries with a socialist orientation is aimed at (a) raising the general cultural level of the population by developing and improving the system of public education and (b) taking steps to advance science, art and all other fields of culture.

Sixthly, in the sphere of foreign policy and international relations, countries on the non-capitalist road adhere to a definite anti-imperialist line. They also pursue a policy of friendly relations and close cooperation with socialist states and a policy of peaceful coexistence with all countries.

Non-capitalist development takes place basically in countries where pre-capitalist socio-economic relations or weakly developed capitalism prevail, whereas development from capitalism to socialism takes place in countries where capitalist relations are relatively advanced. Non-capitalist development requires a relatively long period because the productive forces have to be built up virtually from scratch. While the ultimate goal is socialism, the immediate task is to create the prerequisites for building socialism. In the transition to socialism under the conditions found in a developed capitalist society, however, the building of socialism is both the ultimate goal and the immediate task.

The socialist revolution and the transition from capitalism to socialism are accomplished under the leadership of the working class; in essence, this leadership is the dictatorship of the proletariat. In countries following the non-capitalist road of development, power is in the hands of a broad national-democratic front, a bloc of democratic and progressive forces in which workers, peasants, artisans, the national intelligentsia, as well as the small and middle national bourgeoisie, take part. One of the main goals of non-capitalist development is to consolidate the power of the working people, to strengthen the positions and influence of the most consistent revolutionary forces, to ensure the removal of reactionary elements from the revolution in places where they might still hold power, and to strengthen the alliance of the workers and peasants and all working people. In this way, the prerequisites are created and preparations made for the transition to socialist development.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of imperialism teaches, and practice amply confirms, that imperialist states not only influence events and policies in small and weakly developed countries, but grossly interfere in their internal affairs and saddle them with policies that do not meet the national interests of the peoples of these countries. However, the present international situation assures the newly independent countries relative freedom in choosing the non-capitalist way of development and in moving along it, above all because the imperialists' ex-

clusive right to despotic control over the fate of the world has been abolished once and for all. The dominant position formerly held by the imperialists and the freedom and impunity with which they interfered in the internal affairs of other states have now been relegated to the past. This does not mean that the character of imperialism has changed, but it does mean that its freedom of action has been limited and its influence seriously undermined. The existence of the Soviet Union and the world socialist system and their economic, political and military strength prevent the imperialists from exercising their sway over the developing countries with impunity. They cannot export counter-revolution offhand and on a wide scale.

Of vital importance to the countries on the non-capitalist road and their governments is the establishment and expansion of close ties of sincere cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which consistently pursue a policy of proletarian internationalism.

It is also important to have a correct attitude towards the national liberation movement. Very much depends on the ability of the progressive regimes to pursue a realistic policy, without creating an atmosphere of haste and impatience, without giving the masses any illusions that it will be a quick and easy matter to cope with all the hardships and to achieve universal well-being in a short space of time, while at the same time showing the popular masses the prospects of gradual but stable improvements in the economic position of the country and the living standard of the population. In this connection, explanatory work showing the essence of the non-capitalist development is most important.

In countries that have chosen the non-capitalist way of development, power is usually formed by the revolutionary forces that had headed the national liberation struggle, regardless of whether this power was established during liberation from colonial dominance (Guinea, Algeria) or later, as a result of the overthrow of pro-colonialist puppet governments (Congo-Brazzaville and others), or as a result of a change in the orientation and character of the existing government (Egypt). Participants in the na-

tional liberation struggle come from progressive and anti-imperialist segments of the national bourgeoisie, the revolutionary strata of working people (workers, peasants, artisans, intellectuals), various strata of the petty bourgeoisie of town and country, and other proletarian and semi-proletarian strata of the urban and rural population. It is out of these strata of the population, these social classes, groups and segments, that the national-democratic front is formed, a front that serves as the fulcrum of the people's democratic power, directing the developing countries along the non-capitalist way. In some cases, the army plays an important role if it takes an active part in the process of national liberation or if power is established as a result of a military anti-imperialist coup (Burma, the People's Republic of the Congo, Mali, and others).

In many countries, the fact that the working class is very small in numbers prevents it from playing a leading and decisive role in the socio-political life of the country. But its socio-political significance and influence is much greater than its size in numbers. The working class, concentrated in the cities or industrial centres, the ports and other key areas can exert a strong influence on the political events and economic life of the country. The strength and role of the working class grows along with its heightened political activity and consciousness, along with its rapid growth in numbers due to the industrialisation of the country, the expansion of rail, sea and other kinds of modern transport, and along with the increased role of the working class on a world scale after it became the leading force in the countries of the world socialist system.

At the first stage of non-capitalist development, the anti-imperialist struggle of the working class of the developing countries is aimed first and foremost against foreign monopoly capital, which is the basic exploiter and the personification of capitalist exploitation and oppression.

In a number of African and other countries, the *peasant masses* have taken an active part in the resistance movement against colonial oppression and in the struggle for national liberation. The peasantry makes up the overwhelming majority of the population of these countries.

Therefore, even where the broad masses of peasants are not involved in active socio-political life, their importance with respect to the national liberation movement and the political development of these countries should not be underestimated. In assessing the role and significance of the peasant masses in the developing countries, the following factors should be taken into consideration: the peasant population felt the full brunt of colonial oppression and capitalist exploitation and, consequently, the national liberation struggle was often preceded and accompanied by peasant revolts and uprisings in which the overwhelming majority of the revolutionary peasantry took part. In this way they turned out to be directly and actively involved in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism for national liberation. The peasants have always connected the struggle against colonial oppression with the struggle against exploitation by the feudal and tribal upper crust which had mercilessly exploited the peasant masses in collusion with foreign oppressors. The monstrous exploitation of the peasantry on plantations belonging to the colonialists caused widespread discontent among the peasant masses, whose revolts were aimed directly against the colonial regime and capitalist exploitation.

Another important factor is that in a number of cases small private land ownership was never developed, as a result of which the non-capitalist development of agriculture does not run into such serious difficulties connected with private property attitudes and aspirations as are encountered in countries with developed private land ownership. This makes it easier for the government in such a country to gain broad support from the peasant population for measures and plans aimed at the non-capitalist development of agriculture.

The non-capitalist way of development, along which many young independent Afro-Asian states are now travelling, is the result of the present stage of the national liberation movement that came in the era of the collapse of imperialism and the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. The anti-capitalist tendencies in the countries of the Third World are increasing and will

bring more and more newly independent countries onto the non-capitalist road, which is a stage transitional to socialism. This is an important and inevitable trend in the social development of the peoples of Asia and Africa during the present revolutionary era—the era of the triumph of socialism.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Progress Publishers will
soon publish

ULYANOVSKY R. *Socialism and the Newly Independent Nations.* Progress, Problems of the Third World Series

Professor Ulyanovsky, Doctor of Economics and a noted Soviet scholar, discusses the choice the young national states of Asia and Africa have to make in deciding on a course for achieving economic independence and solving their social problems.

He analyses various types of land reform, the position of the peasantry and the role of the state sector in the economic development of these states.

Various doctrines of socio-economic development of newly free countries and the relation of these doctrines to scientific socialism are examined on the basis of new historical material.

The book contains a well-argued criticism of revisionist and opportunist views on the problems of the national liberation movement, and of some bourgeois neocolonialist theories.

Progress Publishers will
soon publish

TARABRIN E. *The New Scramble for Africa.* Progress. Problems of the Third World Series

The author, Doctor of History, explores the attempts of the imperialist powers to carry out a new division of Africa on a neocolonialist basis. The book examines the intensification and development of the contradictions between the imperialist powers in the redivision of colonies during World War II and the post-war period. Analysing economic aspects of the struggle between the imperialist countries the author examines aid given by the neocolonialist states as a means of competitive struggle, as a monopolies' bid for sources of strategic raw materials. The book also sums up the prospects of imperialist strife in Africa in the 1970s.